DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 857 HE 002 808

AUTHOR	Harcleroad, Fred F., Ed.; Cornell, Jean H., Ed.
TITLE	Assessment of Colleges and Universities.
INSTITUTION	American Coll. Testing Program, Iowa City, Iowa.
REPORT NO	Monogr-6
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	92p.
AVAILABLE FROM	The American College Testing Program, P.O. Box 168, Iowa City, Iowa 52240 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Evaluation; *Educational Accountability; *Evaluation; *Higher Education; *Instructional Programs

ABSTRACT

As American higher education enters the 70s, both its students and the society it serves have raised questions regarding its purposes, structures, and effectiveness. These papers on the assessment of colleges and universities were presented at the 1970 invitational conference of the American College Testing Program. The papers, in the main, emphasize student assessment of their colleges and universities and the assessment by society as a whole of its postsecondary educational institutions. Some of the papers review important historical concepts that make the present air of crisis more understandable. Some of them present evidence of past and present needs of ethnic minorities that can be of genuine help as we grope to find the way from conscious or unconscious racism toward a truly open society. Others describe valuable experimental programs that can provide insights on which to base new curricular and instructional programs. (Author/HS)

ED 058857

MONOGRAPH SIX:

ASSESSMENT OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
American College Testing Program
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

EDITORS:

Fred F. Harcleroad
Jean H. Cornell

CONTRIBUTORS:

Elias Blake, Jr.
Frank G. Dickey
Fred F. Harcleroad
David D. Henry
Darrell Holmes
William Moore, Jr.
Carl T. Rowan
Donald T. Williams, Jr.
O. Meredith Wilson

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PUBLISHED BY:

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE TESTING PROGRAM

ED 058857

ED 058857

ASSESSMENT OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

ED 020821

CONTRIBUTORS

Elias Blake, Jr.
President, Institute for Services to Education

Frank G. Dickey
Executive Director, National Commission on Accrediting

Fred F. Harcleroad
President, The American College Testing Program

David D. Henry
President, University of Illinois

Darrell Holmes
President, University of Northern Colorado

William Moore, Jr.
President, Seattle Central Community College

Carl T. Rowan
Nationally Syndicated Columnist,
Chicago Daily News and Publishers-Hall Syndicate

Donald T. Williams, Jr.
Assistant Professor of Higher Education, University of Washington

O. Meredith Wilson
Director, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

MONOGRAPH SIX:

ASSESSMENT OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

EDITORS:

Fred F. Harcleroad

Jean H. Cornell

PUBLISHED BY:

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE TESTING PROGRAM

The American College Testing Program is dedicated to the enrichment of education. It was founded as an inviolate public trust and operates as a nonprofit corporation governed by educational representatives from individual states or regions and a Board of Trustees.

A fundamental goal of The Program is to exercise educational leadership by conducting testing, information-gathering, evaluating, and related activities toward the end of: (1) assisting in the identification and solution of educational problems, and (2) communicating to the general and professional publics knowledge and ideas about education.

The chief beneficiaries of The Program's services are students, secondary schools, institutions of higher education, and educational researchers.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 76-159772

©1971 by The American College Testing Program
P.O. Box 168, Iowa City, Iowa 52240

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

Price: $3.00

PREFACE

As American higher education enters the 70s, both its students and the society which it serves have raised serious questions regarding its purposes, structure and effectiveness. Support, both fiscal and psychological, has diminished significantly.

In the same year that brought the tragedies at Kent State University and Jackson State College, these papers on the assessment of colleges and universities were presented at the 1970 invitational conference of The American College Testing Program. The papers, in the main, emphasized student assessment of their colleges and universities and the assessment by society as a whole of its postsecondary educational institutions. This represents a significant change in the discussion of "assessment," since it is normally concerned with faculty assessment of students and their success within the established collegial system.

Some of the papers review important historical concepts which make the present air of crisis much more understandable. Some of them present evidence of past and present needs of ethnic minorities which can be of genuine help as we grope to find our way from conscious or unconscious racism toward a truly open society. Others describe valuable experimental programs which can provide insights on which to base new curricular and instructional programs.

Unfortunately, one major presentation at the conference cannot be included properly in this report–a paper concerned w h "personalizing student learning through instructional technology," which was presented by Richard Lewis. He made such complete and effective use of the technology itself that it is not amenable to printed publication. However, it is important to note the broad concept of instructional technology which he emphasized, as follows:

> Instructional technology is more than the sum of its parts. It is a systematic way of designing, carrying out and evaluating the total process of learning and of teaching in terms of specific objectives, based on research in human learning and communication and employing the combination of human and non-human resources to bring about more effective instruction.

Since student assessment of institutions often involved criticism of the quality and effectiveness of the instruction, important future developments in this field can help materially to obviate some of the crescendo of criticism evident in other presentations.

These papers clearly demonstrate that societies establish social institutions as their needs develop, and support them as the institutions meet these needs. In the past century the old American college has vanished, along with normal colleges and mechanics institutes. The land-grant colleges have changed materially and have adopted many of the purposes, forms and reward systems of the graduate university, first established at Johns Hopkins in 1870. The modern state college, the community college, and the proprietary college are important forms of postsecondary education which have grown up within the past half century. The society of the 70s will continue to assess all of postsecondary higher education to determine how well its needs are met. Current institutions will adapt and change, or new forms will take their proper place, as they have for preceding centuries.

Fred F. Harcleroad, *President*
The American College Testing Program

Iowa City, Iowa
June 1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART ONE

Assessment of Colleges and Universities
–Fred F. Harcleroad 3

PART TWO

Students Assess Their Colleges and Universities: Historical Backgrounds
–Donald T. Williams, Jr. 13

PART THREE

Student Groups Assessing Their Colleges and Universities
– William Moore, Jr. 23

PART FOUR

Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness
–Darrell Holmes 35

PART FIVE

Student Assessment in the Accrediting Activity
–Frank G. Dickey 43

PART SIX

A Case Study in Producing Equal Educational Results: The Thirteen College Curriculum Program
–Elias Blake, Jr. 55

PART SEVEN

An Assessment of the Future of Higher Education
–David D. Henry 65

PART EIGHT

Institutional Quality and Effectiveness
–O. Meredith Wilson 79

PART NINE

Assessing Colleges and Universities: The Alternatives
–Carl T. Rowan 89

PART ONE

ASSESSMENT OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

ASSESSMENT OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Fred F. Harcleroad

For nine centuries, since European universities began, three major types of assessment have existed in the colleges and universities of the western world. First, teachers have assessed students; second, western society has assessed its higher educational institutions; and, third, students have assessed their teachers and their institutions. During most of these centuries, the primary assessment has been that of the teacher-disciplinarians, determining finally whether students would receive a certification of competence, usually some degree. The surrounding society constantly has assessed its colleges and universities, supporting them at varying levels or developing new institutions. Finally, students have continually assessed their colleges or universities but with little effect on curriculum or instruction until the 19th and 20th centuries. Here, the major concern will be on the third area—student assessment of their institutions—with a few concluding remarks about society's current assessment of them.

Donald Williams describes student reactions thus in Part Two. "When students . . . have assessed [their institutions] they have done so in . . . colorful ways. They have thrown rocks, . . . boycotted their classes, . . . rioted, . . . harassed their professors, . . . thrown their food upon the floor." Occasionally, they forced out a teacher or president, but they brought about little fundamental change in North European, British, or American higher education until the 1800s.

Close controls over English college students, primarily at Cambridge, moved directly into the American college. The student's entire life was carefully ordered by stated rules. Attendance at chapel was required. Meal times were silent while the Bible was read. Table conversation was in Latin. Early

curfews were strictly enforced. Students looked diligently for loopholes and broke the laws when they couldn't find them. Many of the violent activities were best recorded in the laws that forbid them, such as rules against "throwing stones in chapel.' Savage outbreaks were not uncommon.

All faculty members were basically disciplinarians as well as teachers until the 1800s. This was a difficult task, particularly following wars, when older veteran students used to violence, hardship and death, returned to the colleges. Those returning to college from our Revolutionary War rebelled decisively against the "in loco parentis," English-type discipline with which college authorities greeted them. Everything pleasant seemed forbidden and academic marks were based on a combination of scholarship and conduct. Violent student reactions rose in intensity from the Revolution, into the 1830s. There were a variety of colorful rebellions–such as the Bread and Butter Rebellion of 1805, the Rotten Cabbage Rebellion of 1807, and the great Conic Sections Rebellion at Yale in 1830. Harvard had nine serious rebellions between 1766 and 1843, some lasting for weeks and months. Princeton had six major riots between 1806 and 1862. One hundred and twenty-five students were expelled from Princeton in the 1806 riot, a major portion of the student body. During the great rebellion of 1817 tutors were imprisoned in their rooms, the college outbuildings were burned, pistols were fired, and finally 24 students were expelled and the vice president resigned. After the Conic Sections Rebellion at Yale in 1830, 44 students were summarily dismissed. No other college would accept the 44 students and finally the frequent riots diminished in number.

Students' assessment of their colleges, and evaluation of their effectiveness, began to have a different impact shortly before and after the Yale expulsions. Students started staying away from existing colleges. Eleven of the 12 New England colleges lost enrollment continually from 1830 until the 1870s. Even including Harvard in the total enrollments of the 12 colleges, enrollments fell–in 1838, to where one student was attending for every 1,294 persons in the United States, in 1855, to one student for every 1,689 persons, and in 1869, to one student for every 1,927 persons. Enrollment decreases continued and were a direct evidence of student evaluation of college programs, until the restrictive nature of higher education was drastically changed by the Land Grant College Act in 1862. At the same time the elective system expanded rapidly. It had been briefly begun at Harvard following the revolution of 1823. The impact at that time may very well have been the first actual instance of dramatic change in college or university operation and curricular development caused by American students. Pressure generated by this rebellion led to an official investigation by the Harvard Board of Overseers.

One of the most important resulting changes divided all college studies into those which were "indispensable" and those where a "choice" was permitted. In addition the faculty was called a "faculty" for the first time and was divided into six departments. Likewise, additional new courses were approved as electives, although the faculty continued to be very much opposed.

During the Harvard presidency of Charles W. Eliot, after 1870 and until the early years of the 20th century, the elective system continued to provide students with more opportunity to make their own decisions–and they returned to the campuses in relatively large numbers. Simultaneously the rules for living became less restrictive. For example, President Jordan while at Indiana and before he established Stanford, established very simple rules for conduct: "no students shall fire one of the buildings, nor shoot a member of the faculty." By 1899, 17 institutions had adopted the honor system and students, as a whole, responded less violently to less regulation and more trust. Student extracurricular speech and athletic activities developed during the late 1800s and were eventually co-opted by the faculty into the regular curriculum. In spite of such changes and a few student-initiated developments, student assessment of college programs was unorganized and quite limited until the past 50 years.

Studying this problem 25 years ago I found that student influence had been extended only slightly during the 20th century, although in two main ways: first, through student cooperative efforts with academic authorities, and second, through independent criticisms of existing educational programs. Direct influence was noticeable in the 1920s and 1930s at a few diverse institutions such as Wesleyan, the University of Oregon, Dartmouth, Harvard, Smith, and Rollins. My study concluded, however, that there was a real need for student opinion "... to play a recognized part in the continuous improvement not only of the college curriculum but also of college and university affairs at every point at which they touch students." Two forms of active involvement were suggested: (1) cooperative, formally organized faculty-student discussions, or (2) independent action by students when established channels of expression were inadequate. It was suggested that future evidence would demonstrate that "... much greater effect [will be] exerted on the curriculum by independent student endeavor than through cooperative efforts." [1]

---

[1]Fred F. Harcleroad, *Influence of Organized Student Opinion on American College Curricula: An Historical Survey* (Stanford, California: Stanford University, 1948), p. 207.

During the past quarter of a century, and particularly during the latter years of the 1960s, student assessments and actions have had significant and rapid effects. The evidence is clear in such areas as the development of Black and Chicano studies programs, the discarding of parietal rules in residence halls, and the trend toward pass-fail grading. The great diversity of postsecondary school educational institutions has made it possible for students to "assess with their feet" by selecting one type or another. As federal student assistance has increased, options have become more and more available. It is interesting to note the self-selection involved by students in highly populated areas with a wide variety of available institutions. Pressures from various constituencies have broadened the use of federal and state scholarship funds in wide varieties of institutions. Proprietary institutions, both profit making and nonprofit, often exist very successfully side by side with publicly supported low-tuition institutions.

Of course after the students have selected the institutions which they will attend, there has been a strong push during the past decade (which will undoubtedly continue into the future) to gain recognition of students in a participant role in assessment of faculties, courses and administrative policies. (It is interesting to note that, at the same time, students are making a strong push to eliminate assessment of the students by the faculty!) Undoubtedly, students will continue their drive to participate, in evaluating three areas: first, the curriculum for its relevance, second, the administration for its willingness to hear all sides of questions and give careful consideration to student ideas, and third, faculty assessment, both in the relevance of material taught and the quality and efficiency of the instructional methods used.

William Moore, in Part Three, divides today's students into three groups, representing many "persuasions." The large majority of "normal" students accept higher education as it is, care little about it, and take whatever is offered. Many never complain, are silent, but "drop out or flunk out." The second group, a "big minority," become involved and want change. Their honest efforts, he reports, often are perverted by a few of their group who want destruction, not change. His third group, the disadvantaged, distrust the faculty and administration. They feel they are aliens in the institution, that it is a foreign culture. They feel the institutions are run for the faculty's convenience, and that the faculty, in the main, do not understand them, fail to see them as people and lecture to them in place of developing a dialogue. The author feels that all three groups assess the leadership as inadequate, disinterested in them as persons, and failing in creative innovations. In particular, he feels, as do many current commentators, that college teachers need to be more involved in actual "teaching" and evaluated on this basis.

One of the outstanding national programs attempting to obviate some of these problems, with special attention to needs of black college students, is the Thirteen College Curriculum program, developed by the Institute for Services to Education. In Part Six, Elias Blake, its director, emphasizes the long-term historical problems of the predominantly black colleges and the urgency of preserving and strengthening them. Although the college may not "feel" like a foreign culture as described by Moore, the other student reactions may well be true. The very successful program described by Blake for this group of colleges has many findings of value to any faculty interested in improving college-student development, curricular innovation, and equality of opportunity. A major facet of this program has been the extensive evaluation of student growth in many of the "affective" areas. Faculty concerns about these nonintellective assessments undoubtedly are an important reason for student acceptance of the total program.

Throughout the nation student assessment is expanding fairly rapidly in two other important areas: (1) evaluation of faculty performance and (2) assessment in accreditation activity. Darrell Holmes describes a case example of the first of these in Part Four. As a result of a cooperative student-faculty effort he predicts that "teacher effectiveness measurements will be used in many . . . ways and to an increasing degree until, by 1990, teacher effectiveness measures will be an integral part of a standard professional way of life." The fairly rapid expansion of organized student input into promotion and tenure decisions provides evidence that his prediction indeed may be conservative.

In discussing student assessing of institutions as a part of voluntary accrediting activity, Frank Dickey stresses that sampling activity has often been quite small and often sporadic or haphazard. He points up the "real obligation" as part of the accrediting process "to ask the student to give his frank and honest opinion of the institution, its instructional staff, its curriculum, its services, and the total program of which the student is a vital part."

The direction in which regional voluntary accreditation is moving is well illustrated by the following materials from the Northwest Association. Accreditation by this association is "based on the institution's total strength and in particular upon the success of the institution and each of its constituent parts in formulating and accomplishing its specific objectives. The clarity of institutional objectives and the effectiveness of organization and operation in the attainment of these objectives are of chief concern in final appraisal." In its Report No. I on the Curriculum, a report is required on the "use made of student initiative and reactions in effecting curricular

modifications." In addition, Section J., Instruction, Report No. I, lists a number of items dealing with programs for gifted students, objective evidence showing how students in the institution compare in scholarship with those of other institutions, and the percentage of the entire student body dropped for poor scholarship. In Report No. II on each division or school, the report on the quality of instruction must include analysis of the success of students after graduation, both in graduate study and in professional work. The self-study, evaluation and reporting system calls for an extensive report on the students themselves; including their orientation, counseling, testing, health facilities, housing and food services, student loans, scholarships, grants, and added extracurricular activities and placement activities. In particular, also, it includes "collection of student opinion for the improvement of teaching, curriculum, et cetera." This collection of student opinion could include opinion about the special student services.

Clearly, this accreditation system requires data not only about students but by and from the students. This is an important indication of the increasingly recognized role of students in the assessment of their colleges and universities.

Students may not have the total experience or sufficient time or talent for more than limited participation in campus governance. However, as their legitimate educational needs are met their demands may not be so strident. David Henry, in assessing the future of all of higher education, clearly recognizes this possibility and stresses the necessity to respond to student assessment in appropriate ways, with this caution: "In the current pressure to formalize and expand student participation in every area of the campus activities, it will be as destructive to issue a blanket acceptance of representation as it is dangerous to continue a total exclusion. I am strongly in favor of a student voice in each assessment procedure where their experience and competence make their representation relevant to the issues at hand."

Turning now from student assessment of colleges and universities to that by society at large, it is clear that a general malaise exists throughout the United States.

An intensive assessment of higher education, as a whole, is being made by the society which supports it. The basic purposes of the universities, as developed and controlled by their faculties and administrators, have been called into question. In some cases, outside social forces have had sudden and pervasive effects. Clear evidence exists in current moves to performance budgeting, lower budgets at federal and state levels, pressures for external

degrees, new forms of higher education, voucher systems, and "open admissions." In one year (1970) for example, the "open" admissions program of the City University of New York raised the number of city high school graduates going on to some form of full-time higher education from 57 percent to 76 percent, a truly dramatic increase. This was a direct result of the tremendous social forces exerted by large ethnic minority groups in New York City. Their assessment of their institutions led them to demand these changes, sometimes violently, from those who controlled access to these community colleges and universities. Another example is the estimated 1.5 million students attending high-cost proprietary business and technical colleges when there are, nearby, low-tuition community and/or state colleges offering comparable fields of study.

In total, American society is calling into question the effectiveness of our higher education institutions to meet current and future needs with the habits, structures, methods, and requirements built up in the past two decades. Carl Rowan points out in the final part that this is an "era of grim contradictions" when we "yearn for peace" and "fight with a savagery unexceeded in human history." The colleges, he says, "are caught in the middle" of a "profound crisis of belief, . . . pressures that threaten to tear this society apart." He, as well as many other critics and thinkers of our society, count on our higher education institutions to "lead the way" in preserving the society. At the same time funds are being withheld from them, their status and former high regard are visibly lowered, faculty tenure is being attacked in many states, and the organized faculty and administrative groups are widely accused of being inadequate and lacking needed flexibility and strength. It is truly a time of trial for existing colleges and universities. The society which constantly assesses them will establish new types of institutions if those which exist are inadequate and cannot meet society's requirements. In the early 1800s the old American college gave way to the Mechanics Institute, the Normal School, the Women's College, and finally to the Land Grant College. In turn the graduate university developed and more recently the modern state college and the community college.

Meredith Wilson reminds us in his superb essay on "Institutional Quality and Effectiveness" that colleges and universities must exist because students ". . . cannot reach beyond what they know, nor higher than their own experiences . . . unless challenged by more experienced minds, and enriched by some externalized expression of higher aspirations." He points out further that they no longer serve a small homogeneous group of students but now serve eight million students who are members of many heterogeneous groups. These numbers and the wide diversity of postsecondary educational oppor-

tunities make evaluation difficult. However, he also emphasizes that "... whatever you may decide about how to measure the quality of an institution, the effectiveness will be revealed by a measure of what has been added to the individuals in these natural groups, how far toward socially accepted goals the selected students may have moved as a result of the collegiate experience."

In this dramatic, watershed period of assessment of all of our American social institutions, colleges and universities face their greatest period of questioning and challenge in this century. In 1970, just at their pinnacle of material achievement, recognition and social status, they have been assessed and found wanting in several ways. Some of them may go the way of the old American college or the normal school, unless they adapt to new social demands. Perhaps through cooperative assessment activities students can help with the searching internal analysis which is currently underway on those campuses which will continue to serve the society of the 1980s.

PART TWO

STUDENTS ASSESS THEIR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES: HISTORICAL BACKGROUNDS

STUDENTS ASSESS THEIR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES: HISTORICAL BACKGROUNDS

Donald T. Williams, Jr.

The planners of this conference have done me a good turn, and I should like to open my paper by expressing my appreciation. They had their choice between a paper on how students assess their colleges and universities and one on how these institutions assess their students. Had the conference planners chosen the latter subject, mine would have proven a dull project indeed because colleges and universities through history have shown little creativity in their assessment strategies. My work no doubt would have taken me to the dustiest chambers of university archives there to find the particular marks, or grades, or rankings, or scores, or what have you, whereby colleges and universities have recorded their assessment of their students.

When students, by contrast, have assessed the quality of their colleges and universities, they have done so in far more colorful ways. They have thrown rocks. They have boycotted their classes. They have rioted. They have harassed their professors. They have thrown their food upon the floor. Such procedures, for me, hold far more interest than file upon file of dusty transcripts, and I have therefore entered eagerly into my investigations.

At the start it would seem safe to say about this subject what I find myself saying about so many topics of this sort: its history is as old as the history of higher education itself. Students have always assessed the quality of the higher education they have received; and they have done so in many different ways, including the violent ones to which I have just so facetiously referred.

Pre-Medieval Assessments

Starting, therefore, with the beginnings of higher education in Greece some five centuries before the birth of Christ, one finds the Sophists, whose efforts are so often criticized today but who rated high in the assessments of the Greek youths who paid for the privilege of studying with them. One of the most famous of the Sophists, Protagorus, found he could, for example, charge his students ten thousand drachmas, a truly incredible sum at the time, for the three- to four-year course of study which he offered.

By the same token the school headed by Isocrates far outdid Plato's Academy during the years the two competed against each other in the same community. In the words of Sorbonne historian H. I. Marrou (1956), "On the whole it was Isocrates, not Plato, who educated fourth century Greece and subsequently the Hellenistic and Roman worlds [p. 120]." Students then as today judged their schools according to their relevance, and the practical wisdom and training for politics offered by Isocrates spoke directly to their needs.

Most "professors" in those early years depended for their income upon the fees paid them by their students. Where rival schools and rival teachers drew from the same pool of students in a given community, the competition could become quite fierce, and students entered into this competition with gusto. Cowley (1970a) writes, for example, about teachers in the fourth century A.D. who encouraged their own students to undermine rival teachers "by invading their lecture rooms and starting fights there, by throwing mud in their faces on the streets, by dragging them out of bed at night for a dousing in a fountain or a pond, and by other such persecutions [pp. 11-24]." Such assessments in our time have gone as far as invading the lecture room, but I should hope, as the potential target of such actions, that today's students will go no further. Their more violent activities in the fourth century, on the other hand, led Augustine to leave teaching for another line of work, a move which benefited the Church and mankind considerably.

The traditions and practices begun in Athens and extended into the Roman period continued in the later Byzantine and Islamic civilizations, where state- and church-sponsored institutions of higher education prevailed. Islamic students, for instance, continued the Greek and Roman practice of moving from school to school, from teacher to teacher, and in this way registered their impressions as to which schools and which teachers were best. Centers such as Baghdad in the East, Cordova in the West, and Timbuktu in the South thereby gained fame as centers of Islamic scholarship. By the time Timbuktu had emerged as an important place of learning, however, new forms of higher

education had begun operating in western Europe. The centers for this higher learning, as with the Islamic peoples, grew in response to the great teachers residing there, and scholars such as Irnerius and Abelard had much to do with Bologna and Paris later emerging as important university cities.

Medieval and Reformation Assessments

Of course, the person concerned about the student role in medieval universities turns first to Bologna, the historic example of a balance of power which for some two centuries favored students over their teachers. Rashdall (1895) provides numerous details of student assessments, including reference to fines assessed the professor when attendance at his lectures fell below a minimum level (Vol. 1, p. 196), to the measure of his popularity as provided by the size of the facilities required for his lectures (Vol. 1, p. 217), and again to his dependence upon student fees (Vol. 3, p. 354), all of which gave students the authority to reward those they judged as good and to force the others out of the university.

Professors at Bologna (Rashdall, 1895) late in the thirteenth century began receiving state salaries, and this led eventually to the dissolution of student power; but even in this instance students into the fourteenth century retained the authority to select the occupants of these prized chairs (Vol. 1, p. 210). Medieval teachers throughout Europe had no stronger commitment to teaching than their modern counterparts, but at least in the student-universities, according to Rashdall, "the chairs would appear to have been most competently filled and their duties most efficiently discharged [Vol. 3, p. 452]."

In northern Europe the impact of student assessments does not appear nearly so great, although the arts masters who controlled Paris during much of her early existence were in some senses what we today would call TAs. Suffice it to suggest that state and church officials held greater power in these institutions than in southern Europe, and the students probably had their greatest impact in their decision whether or not to enroll with a given professor in a given school.

So, too, with institutions of the Reformation in cities such as Geneva, Leyden, Edinburgh, Cambridge, and Dublin, where the church retained a strong voice. But add now the growing influence of lay people, often town councilmen, who further dissipated the student voice. The American colonial colleges drew from models such as these more than the earlier model in Bologna. Surprisingly, however, students in this country early entered into the assessment function, and they did so in most dramatic ways.

Colonial and Eighteenth Century American Assessments

American students showed their prowess as assessors of their colleges from the very beginning. This beginning, as everyone knows, commenced at Harvard with the opening of classes in 1638. Within one year students had registered their distaste for the first head of the college, Nathaniel Eaton, and September of 1639 finds them testifying in court against the harshness of his discipline and the disgraceful quality of his wife's cooking.

Several subsequent Harvard presidents suffered similar fates. Thus, Harvard's third head, Leonard Hoar, resigned in March of 1675 after students—in the tradition of Bologna, Oxford, and other medieval universities—deserted the campus in protest against his policies. One of the students of that year, Cotton Mather (1702), described their tactics thus:

> Students set themselves to travestie whatever he *did* and *said* and aggravate every thing in his behavior disagreeable to them, with a design to make them *odious* [p. 147].

Samuel Langdon (Morison, 1937) likewise became the subject of a student petition in the summer of 1780 which read in part as follows:

> As a man of genius and knowledge we respect you; as a man of piety and virtue we venerate you; as a President we despise you [p. 162].

Such student assessments, aimed at presidents and tutors alike (Brubacher & Rudy, 1969), reflected the genuine turbulence of this time, one in which student rebellions "peppered the annals of every college in America [p. 40]," making it "a period of rowdies, riots, and rebellion [p. 51]." Much of this discontent grew from the mass of rules which governed the students' lives, rules which produced an atmosphere likened by Brubacher and Rudy (1969) to "a low-grade boys' boarding school straight out of the pages of Dickens [p. 52]." Some of the riots related to food, and those at Harvard have come down to us as The Great Bread and Butter Rebellion of 1766 (which required a month to quell), the Bread and Butter Rebellion of 1805, and the Rotten Cabbage Rebellion of 1807. A disagreement at Yale in 1830 over a mathematics assignment led to the so-called Conic Section Rebellion. In all Harvard suffered nine serious outbreaks between 1766 and 1843 (Cowley, 1970b, pp. 6-11), and these outbreaks told all who learned of them that something was indeed wrong with America's premier institution of higher learning.

Nineteenth Century Assessments

These activities continued, then, into the nineteenth century. A major

disruption in 1823, for example, provided the atmosphere wherein George Ticknor (Tyack, 1967) could make some changes–unfortunately short-lived–in academic life at Harvard (Ch. 3). And at Dartmouth in this century students developed a particularly violent procedure for informing their instructors of their assessment. Dartmouth historian Leon Burr Richardson (1932) describes one such incident this way:

> . . . an instructor who had acquired some degree of unpopularity was selected as a victim of a demonstration of this type. When seated in his office in Thornton Hall in the evening, he was assailed by a mob made up for the most part of members of the sophomore class, many of them disguised, and bringing with them whatever noise-making instruments were available, who proceeded to make the night hideous with their clamor. The instructor, who was in plain sight of the mob, remained, to all purposes, quite undisturbed. Apparently angered by this exhibition of *sang froid,* the rioters proceeded further in their disorderly conduct than was the usual custom. Snowballs began to fly through the window, and soon a convenient pile of coal . . . furnished even more effective missiles [p. 717].

Meanwhile in the nineteenth century the impact of student assessments took several new turns. For instance, literary societies developed libraries and explored subjects relevant to the students to a depth untouched by the college teachers of that time. Students chose to attend colleges which seemed to them to be speaking to the important issues and needs of the period, and to not attend those colleges which for their purposes had nothing to offer. Thus the students at Lane Seminary, when that school's officials refused to permit discussions of abolition, assessed the worth of the school as minimal and moved en masse to the newly formed Oberlin College, giving that institution a sizable infusion of new students and a mission with which it became closely identified in subsequent years.

The curricula of the early nineteenth century American literary colleges did indeed lack relevance. The students and their parents knew this, and as already mentioned, they boycotted higher education quite effectively. As Brown University President Francis Wayland commented in 1850 (Rudolph, 1962, p. 220):

> We have produced an article for which the demand is diminishing. We sell it at less than cost, and the difference is made up by charity. We give it away, and still the demand diminishes. Is it not time to inquire whether we cannot furnish an article for which the demand will be, at least, somewhat more remunerative?

Such a demand for more relevant higher education began receiving a response after the Civil War. It appeared at land-grant universities such as Cornell, where Andrew Dickson White succeeded in blending qualities of the land-grant movement, the coeducation of Oberlin, and the research orientation of the German universities in such a way that student enrollments began

to grow. Meanwhile Charles William Eliot found success in introducing the elective principle into the curriculum, and this allowed at least one of the historic literary colleges to develop curricula which students and their parents judged had greater relevance to their needs. Enrollment at Harvard subsequently grew, and this pace at Harvard, Cornell, and like institutions continued into the twentieth century.

Twentieth Century Assessments

During this century, student assessments of their colleges and universities have taken several forms. We tend today to think most often of the violence; but other, less dramatic strategies have also emerged. Some of these activities, as described by Harcleroad (1948), "were totally unknown to previous generations [p. 112]."

One such activity apparently began at Barnard College during the academic year 1921-22, when a report written by a "Student Curricular Committee" called for college officials to accept a new, student-written curriculum. The Barnard student report did not win college support, but it attracted the attention of the student editor of the *Daily Dartmouth,* W. H. Cowley (1970a), who saw similar defects in the Hanover institution. Before long he had succeeded in provoking President Hopkins into appointing a twelve-member student committee to make "a complete survey, review and examination of [the college's] educational processes [pp. 3, 11-22]." Upon reading the eventual statement of the Dartmouth students, the editor of *New Republic* (1924) expressed a view strikingly familiar to contemporary ears. He wrote:

> This is no isolated phenomenon. Those who know the present generation of undergraduates know that this yeast is working in them everywhere. Everywhere are rumblings against "the system," polite petitions, and dogged persistent sabotage. . . . They feel that they have asked for bread and we have given them stone facades. . . . They are praying for a recovery of humanity in learning.

The Dartmouth statement in turn encouraged students at other institutions to undertake similar efforts, and Bowdoin, Oregon, Northwestern, Middlebury, Vassar, Harvard, and Yale were included in the fourteen colleges and universities which by 1931 had completed such studies (Harcleroad, p. 116). Harvard's student council between 1926 and 1946 actually completed five separate reports on curriculum alone (Harcleroad, p. 116). Those who have seen them, especially the one of 1939 (Harvard University, 1939, p. 123), claim a strong influence of these reports on the Harvard faculty's *General Education in a Free Society,* which appeared in 1945.

This writing of student reports generally died with the advent of World War II, but another activity which also had emerged during the twenties, that of student ratings of individual faculty members and their courses, continued strong after the war and down to the present day. Some of these reports, such as that at Harvard which first appeared in 1924, have originated with the students themselves. Over two hundred and fifty such reports now appear regularly. Other, faculty-originated questionnaires also began appearing in the twenties at institutions such as Purdue, Texas, and my own University of Washington. Leaders such as H. H. Remmers of Purdue, W. R. Wilson and E. R. Guthrie at the University of Washington, Franz Schneider at the University of California, and J. W. Riley at Brooklyn College doggedly pursued their colleagues, urging them to seek out their students' assessment of their teaching. During the period after the war the National Students Association made these rating systems available, and student leaders availed themselves readily of them.

Such activities, as already mentioned, continue in accelerated form today. Suffice it to repeat in summary that students have assessed the quality of their colleges and universities since the beginnings of these institutions. They have done so in a number of ways: by violence, by boycott, by petition, by generating their own forms of higher education, by writing extensive reports aimed at producing the changes students recognize as important, by completing questionnaires in which they rate the quality of their teachers and their courses, and in a host of other ways.

Such efforts strike me for the most part as having had a positive impact on American higher education. Students through time, for one thing, have shown themselves to have a good insight into relevance; and, while relevance–as attested by the example cited earlier of Plato and Isocrates–is not properly the sole criterion for assessing the quality of higher education, it belongs in any combination of criteria one might consider. Students belong, then, as members of the "team" when assessments are made.

In his recent book, *Students Without Teachers,* Harold Taylor has urged university officials to show a new faith in students, a faith that admits that students have insights into the changes which today's colleges and universities need to make. From what I have managed to learn from the past, we indeed have much to gain from such a faith; and I trust that many college and university leaders today will share that view.

References

Brubacher, J., & Rudy, W. *Higher education in transition.* (2nd ed.) New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Cowley, W. H. Professors, presidents, and trustees. In manuscript, Stanford University, 1970. (a)

Cowley, W. H. Short history of American higher education. In manuscript, Stanford University, 1970. (b)

Harcleroad, F. F. Influence of organized student opinion on American college curricula: An historical survey. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, School of Education, 1948.

Harvard University, Harvard Student Council. Report of the student committee on education, Cambridge, Mass., June 1939.

Marrou, H. I. *A history of education in antiquity.* New York: The New American Library, 1956. Paperback ed.

Mather, C. The history of Harvard college. In *Old south leaflets.* Vol. 8, No. 184. Boston: Directors of the Old South Work, 1702.

Morison, S. E. *Three centuries of Harvard.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937.

Rashdall, H. *The universities of Europe in the middle ages.* Powicke ed. Vols. 1, 3. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1895.

Richardson, L. B. *History of Dartmouth college.* Vol. 2. Hanover, Mass.: Dartmouth College Publications, 1932.

Tyack, D. *George Ticknor and the Boston Brahmins.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Wayland, F. On changes in the system of collegiate education. Report read to the Corporation of Brown University, Providence, R.I., March 28, 1950. Cited by F. Rudolph, *The American college and university: A history.* New York: Knopf, 1962. P. 220.

What the undergraduate wants. Editorial. *New Republic,* July 30, 1924, **39,** 258-260.

PART THREE

STUDENT GROUPS ASSESSING THEIR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

STUDENT GROUPS ASSESSING THEIR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

William Moore, Jr.

Against the backdrop of war, poverty, crime, and drugs; in the face of backlash, law and order, and the report that God is dead (which may be exaggerated); out of the rhetoric of moderates and extremists, centerists and wingers, coalitionists and purists; and the resultant polarity and lack of credibility between blacks and whites, young and old, rich and poor; and in view of the many other confrontations, conflicts, and dilemmas of change, no majority could remain silent. Students represent all of these persuasions, and as such, they speak out. They do assess their colleges and universities.

First, there is that vast majority of students we can identify who do not really rebel against anything; who do not dissent. They are that wonderful group of students who educators frequently like to teach because these students have passed all the right examinations and have achieved good test scores. This group of students never really bothers to assess their institutions. They came to the institution in the first place because the counselor suggested they should come, their parents insisted they go to college, or because a doctor, lawyer, or some other friend of the family recommended the college. The college chosen may have been chosen for the prestige it brings to the parents. By and large, the students could not have cared less. This attitude is an assessment.

These students come to the colleges and the universities and take whatever their teachers give, from Sandpile 101 to Basket Weaving. They take the courses offered and don't question them. They have an open mind. You can shovel almost anything into it. They do not complain, or when they do, it is

about the dormitory hours, food in the cafeteria, the parking problem, and other annoyances which are hardly relevant to a good education. For the most part, these students keep their mouths shut, take what is given to them, and, more than one would think, will never get out of college. They are the children of the silent majority. Too many of them are silent and drop out or flunk out and never really say anything. Some of them get a degree; about one-fourth of them do go on and become the doctors, lawyers, teachers, and whatever one becomes when he gets out of school.

There is a second group of students who are concerned about our colleges, and who are trying to make an assessment of education. They are the rebels–a large minority of students who are sensitive to the rigidity of educational institutions and to the social problems of our times. These are the students who correctly view their colleges as the elitist institutions they are. While the students are screaming, "I see poverty, greed, graft in high places, and racism," their professors, like their parents, dismiss these pleadings with bootstrap sociology ("The poor, et al., will have to learn to pick themselves up by their bootstraps."). The students are saying "each one teach one"; and the colleges and universities are responding, "every man for himself." The students are asking that their institutions examine *real* problems, while the curriculum designers continue to perform *classroom exercises.* Their professors are still talking about *competition* and *winning and losing,* and the students are concerned with *participation.* While their professors describe the poverty, filth, and degradation of a Dickens novel in the classroom, the students are out volunteering in the ghettos of Watts, Hough, and Harlem; and on the Indian reservations in Washington and Arizona. The students are imbued with the Age of Aquarius and their professors are discussing the "good old days." In short, many young people view their colleges as espousing abstract platitudes about the way things *ought to be*–the rhetoric; and the students are attempting to deal with things the way they *are*–the realities.

Disadvantaged students are still another group of students who assess their colleges. They observe, are sensitive to, and understand the attitudes of their instructors in many more ways; more than one might suspect. They constantly point out that their instructors avoid relationships with them; never get to know them as people (Sanford, 1967; Morgan, 1970); and are never aware of their emotional and economic burdens. The students say their teachers are not concerned about what they think or how they feel. And they emphasize the fact that no thread of continuity between subject matter and compassion is ever discernible–no warmth, no advice or counsel, no real-life encounter; never a brief pause at the cafeteria table to exchange pleasantries.

Faculties rarely extend to, or accept from, the disadvantaged an invitation to exchange away-from-school visits; these students know the facts of life and do not expect any of the other interactions which demonstrate there is positive communication between a teacher and his students.

The least sophisticated among the disadvantaged knows that faculties do not expect much of them academically and never discover what talents they may have. They say that teachers do not anticipate or believe they have the ability to create and develop knowledge and are surprised when they do. Disadvantaged students are concerned that their teachers do not bother to understand them, their language, or their life style. In this particular frame of reference, the students are extrasensitive to the fact that their teachers never see any good in their culture, habits, and background, or know their heroes and idols. Moreover, their tutors question their slang, stereotype their behavior, do not read their favorite authors, or explore their values. The untypical students also know that they are accused repeatedly of being disinterested, incapable of learning, and immature.

The students from the ghetto, along with other disadvantaged community college registrants, say their instructors act as though teaching them is less satisfying than teaching others. They actually know teachers who do not want to teach them and who say so. This group of teachers wins the respect of the students because they are honest enough to say how they feel. Others are not so honest. Whether the teachers confess or not, the word gets around.

The students express many other resentments about their teachers and the institution. They contend, for example, that their instructors only work to serve their own interests. To illustrate, the students point out that teachers assist in making out the class schedule to insure that the schedule will serve their convenience and meet their needs at the expense of the students' needs. Poor students, in particular, cite the length of the instruction day and the compacted span of the classes in a few hours (usually 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon, or 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.) as examples of this self-serving behavior. This situation is of particular significance for the young or old student who must work all day and attend school some time after 2:00 p.m. One eastern community college president states, "At 2:30 p.m. you can shoot a cannon down the corridor of any building on this campus and never hit anything human unless it is a student, custodian, or librarian." In some colleges, faculty members feel they should have extra compensation for working with the disadvantaged.

Disadvantaged students also resent the fact that they are used as the subjects of proposals to obtain education grants from the federal government. Once

the project is funded, the students know that they profit little from the resources. They see the same instructors who refuse or claim inability to teach them, apply for and get the job of teaching them–to earn extra money. Maggie T., a former New Careers student and now a teacher in the Chicago schools, attacks this hypocrisy with biting rhetoric: "Put some bread [money] in the pen and my colleagues are the first hogs to the trough."

Ghetto students are bitter when they hear teachers explain away their ineffective instruction as being due to the students' "culturally deprived" background. Even the students know their success, or lack of it, is less a factor of their "cultural deprivation" than it is of good teaching and quality education. "They always blame us for what they don't do," states Norman Birnbaum of Los Angeles City College. Students repeatedly indicate that they cannot understand how instructors with MAs and PhDs, who are supposed to be experts in their fields, who claim to like students, and who have been consistently evaluated as effective teachers, reach an academic menopause when it comes to producing good education for the disadvantaged.

Students discover other things about their middle-class teachers. They learn, for example, about the sacredness of subject matter and that the instructor dictates the terms for learning. Students soon discover that instructors conduct only monologues with them–never dialogues. Always one-way talk. They also learn that they are not considered partners in the learning process. Most of all, they discover that subject matter is sacrosanct. This worship of subject matter does two things:

1. It indicates that "Imparting volumes of subject matter, without priorities of relevance, becomes the goal. The strategy is to avoid relationships with the students in spite of the fact that these relationships are probably necessary for the students to learn. Instead of forming relationships the fearful teacher takes flight into sacredness of subject matter and technique. The student is overlooked as a person who is looking for help (Morgan, 1970)."

2. It also says that the teacher considers himself the most important human component–not the student. Consequently, he tolerates little inquiry from the disadvantaged. He does not encourage or expect these students to raise issues. The students never have an opportunity to experience the subject matter as a dialogue between generations, but see their teachers constantly revive the past, and fail to connect it to the present. It appears to the students that the past has the higher priority in most of their classes. Disadvantaged students believe their tutors would be lost without their painstakingly compiled notes, and they are convinced their teachers feel the only way

education progresses is through the proliferation of books. They do not like the lecture. The lecture is one of the most primitive, most used, and most ineffective teaching methods. It is not a good method; it is, however, the one that is the hallmark of college instruction.

The students routinely expect the teachers to criticize their communication skills. If the students are black, they know they are automatically expected to accept white standards–standards which many young blacks now reject. Young minority group students point out that their teachers never seem to feel as secure to expose their ignorance as they do their knowledge to the students. The students observe this and talk about it. They are constantly looking for the things that make their teachers human. The students suggest that only the negative attitudes of the instructors betray their human qualities and even that is inhuman.

On the other hand, the students know that their teachers are running scared, uptight, and seem to get ulcers on the spot when they must deal with the disadvantaged for any considerable time. The students also know that their teachers will immediately fall back on the subject matter under the most superficial stress.

Community college students from the ghetto are aware their professors are not loyal to them. They know faculty members award their loyalty to society's natural winners and not to its consistent losers. As we have seen, the attitudes of disadvantaged students toward their teachers in colleges and universities are deep and pervasive; and the experiences that they relate reveal profound dissatisfactions. There is little question how disadvantaged students assess their institutions. More specifically, the assessment is related directly to the people-to-people interactions.

All of these groups assess their administrators. It is common discussion among them that the present educational leadership in institutions is inadequate in terms of either knowing or solving their educational problems. Furthermore, administrators are as selfish in sharing power as are other groups. It is no secret that administrators attend conferences to recruit staff, to look for new positions, search for methods to counteract pressure being brought about by the respective communities, and try to get on committees to bring status to themselves and their institutions. They do not attend conferences in order to exchange information about current educational problems and to explore innovative solutions to the problems raised.

They demonstrate that they are more concerned about control, channels, and reports than they are with what happens to students, especially minority and low-income students. It is clearly discernible that they are more concerned with the credentials of the people they hire than with the quality of instruction performed by those professionals hired. These administrators may not even be aware of the kind of education which is relevant for a large percentage of the people in their colleges. They are aloof, inaccessible, and practice institutionalized racism. Aloofness creates barriers to communication and develops, in those who practice it, a lack of sensitivity to the problems in their own institutions. Administrators are no longer leaders in education; they are managers of buildings and budgets. Thus, administrators disregard logical events, while they call for innovation which must fit the system.

Students are not willing to continue to permit educators to distort the facts. They listen to administrators and faculties when these two groups insist they cannot locate "qualified" minorities to teach on college and university campuses. This second group of students has listened to the verbiage about creativity and innovation in teaching, and has seen the government, major foundations, and other sources fund the development of these two concepts. Yet, basic instruction is still carried on in a 30′ x 30′ classroom, with someone in front talking to an audience in various stages of listening, boredom, and frustration. It is constantly noted by students that innovation is carried on in most institutions only as an experiment. The consequence of this absurdity is that innovation which does not become part of the existing and operating system will be ignored and will not have profited the institution, or the faculties and students for whom it was intended.

Students who make the above observations support much of the activity of activist students. They support encounter, confrontation, and dissension because it is rather well-established that neither dialogue nor action will take place in the power centers of college and university communities without confrontation. Even then, change is not likely to be forthcoming. The words *change* and *relevance* have been used so excessively that they are cliche. Nonetheless, the students continue to demand some meaningful change and involvement, although they are treated as if they have committed educational heresy when they suggest that the college fulfill the contract made with them. They are asking, for example, that professors carry the same teaching loads as teaching assistants. They are demanding that when you sign up for Professor X's course, they expect to see the professor sometime. One must admit that this is hardly an irrational request. Yet, it would be a *change*. The more conservative among us will not agree with much of the student behavior; still, it must be conceded that the young people are asking many of the right

questions. They are simply not willing to entertain the charades of the educators when the latter says on the one hand, "we agree with what you say"; and on the other hand, prescribe how the students should "petition"–and then do nothing about student concerns. A few years ago, the students did petition the "right way" (whatever that means). College students in the late forties and fifties petitioned incessantly. For the most part, they were ignored. If they demanded too much, they were turned off; if they boycotted or attempted to sit in, infrequently they were suspended–or worse, expelled. When the dean sent for a student, the student was in trouble. Now when the dean sends for a student, the dean is in trouble.

The students suggest that the administrators and faculties in their colleges and universities closely parallel our elected representatives in Congress and in other legislative bodies; i.e., both of these groups who hold power distract the attention of the public from focusing on the real issues by directing that attention to such inconsequential things as the beards and clothing students wear, the language many of them use, the resistance to taking baths, and other such rituals which trigger tensions in the insecure middle-class intellect. In so doing, they keep people busy with symbols of their real and imaginary fears, while they both secure profits and power for themselves. Neither is being held accountable and neither is responding to the needs of its constituency.

Students are well aware that professors, institutions, graduate students, and many, many other people have been subsidized through government grants. These individuals and institutions have been given thousands of dollars to help students (who rarely get anything). Students state specifically that junior colleges and senior colleges have remained traditional in terms of priorities. The faculties which serve these institutions, the curricula taught in them, and the men who administer them do not know the students they serve. And the institutions do not even encourage the educationally disadvantaged to apply. Furthermore, institutions refuse to do anything significant about admissions policies and placement. Many say that the institutions practice institutionalized racism.

The students also say many things about faculties. In higher education they feel there is little or no involvement of teachers in teaching. Teachers are concerned with classloads, salaries, fringe benefits, and academic freedom. They seldom have the dedication to students that they have to salary and working conditions. Teachers want influence in curriculum, administration, and every other facet of the college. Yet, the students point out that there is not a corresponding interest in students and education. One of the most

interesting observations which can be made is the overwhelming evidence that colleges and universities do not demonstrate accountability. It is common now to hear people say that instructors should be paid in terms of what they do.

It is hardly profound to indicate that teachers are unable to handle students whose cultural, economic, and educational handicaps are different from those they normally handle, even though they are supposed to be experts. You never hear an expert architect say, "I can't build a house over the swamp." He finds a way. You never hear a doctor say, "I can't treat you because you are too near death." He treats you. Yet, college teachers say, "We can't teach you if your test scores are not at a certain level; if your IQ is not in the right place." In short, if those in education are supposed to be experts at their jobs, one should expect to see the results.

In summary, the first group of students is normal (whatever that means). They obey the rules, obey the laws, do not create much of a problem, study hard, *and we still lose a majority of them.*

The second group is involved in change, but this second group is often infiltrated by students who aren't interested in change; or they are interested only in change as they see it. This prostitutes what that second group wants. And what are we doing? I think we are reacting to the ones who are prostituting change, and not reacting to the problems of change. More specifically, we look at the distraction rather than the problem.

The third group of students who are assessing their institutions are the blacks, Chicanos, and the others who get there—who become hired hands to some extent, with a little access to special programs or funds. Most of them never get through. They are not a part of anything. They get their own counselors, their own remedial programs. They don't get their own classrooms. They get the classrooms that someone else doesn't want. They have squatter's rights in this way, and they soon drop out—more frustrated than they were before.

These are the three groups of students who are coming to our campuses each day. They know more about us than we know about them. They know how we are going to react but we haven't learned how to act before they act. We always respond to them. We never offer very much leadership to these groups of students. I would suggest that this is the way at least these three student groups are responding to and assessing our colleges and universities.

References

Morgan, G. D. *The ghetto college student: A descriptive essay on college youth from the inner city.* Iowa City, Iowa: The American College Testing Program, 1970.

Sanford, N. *Where colleges fail.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967.

PART FOUR

EVALUATING TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS

EVALUATING TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS

Darrell Holmes

Intuitively, pragmatically we believe assessing teacher effectiveness is important.

Reasons for evaluating teacher effectiveness can be illustrated by the following kinds of goals:

1. To enable the teacher to understand his interactions with students and thus enhance his teaching.
2. To enable students to attain a better understanding of the teacher in a particular classroom, and of the teachers around them in general; and to understand and improve their own "learning effectiveness."
3. To develop an understanding through research of the practical and theoretical characteristics of good teaching in all settings, and the kinds of philosophical and technical problems associated with such research.
4. To use the effectiveness concept to reward the good teacher for productivity; to help increase productivity.

At the university, some of us have for some time maintained a modest interest in this general arena of research and have been quite interested in the first three of the above reasons. We are not involved in any official institutional evaluative program to reward the good teacher for productivity. Parenthetically, I would remark that our recent Faculty Senate policy statement in regard to pay raises indicated that approximately 25 percent of the pay raise should be associated with merit. The basis for determining "merit" is one of judgment. Justifiable skepticism exists on campus about the

validity of judgments so used, or any other currently available method of determining quality. We cannot reliably make qualitative differentiations among individual faculty. Yet. . .

Permit me to make a prediction. This in spite of the fact that Mark Twain is reported to have said, "It's dangerous to make a prediction in May . . . June . . . July . . . August." But here it is: teacher effectiveness measurements will be used in many different ways and to an increasing degree until, by 1990, teacher effectiveness measures will be an integral part of a standard professional way of life. The reason for this prediction is somewhat complex. Basically, it revolves around my hunch that in the years ahead qualitative improvements will be well supported by the general public; whereas, today we may well have run the course of enjoying accelerating public support to meet increasing quantitative demands, at least for the present.

Quality is crucial. People are serious about education. Education is much more than a cultural rite or religious ceremony. People in this country and around the world see it both as a means and an end; and the variety of perceptions about education match the number of people thinking about it. There is a restless concern with our efforts . . . a feeling that our system is good *and* definitely improvable. People *are* in search of meaning, and each person *will find* it for himself. If we in education don't "produce" and help people help themselves, we will see new institutions impinging on "our domain," and we will lose not only a lot of the action but also a sense of being professionally useful. Quality continues to be a key word.

An administrator–anyone–trying to do something about evaluating teacher effectiveness may not be able to walk on water, but he certainly must seem to do so; consequently, he should know where the posts are.

We clearly need coordinated research efforts to determine these posts. I would hope that the professional capabilities at our university would be widely used, that our efforts could be correlated with regional and national efforts. We are involved.

With financial support from the Student Congress and The American College Testing Program, we have mounted a multifaceted effort: we are building within our Bureau a resource of professional expertise, providing an evaluation service for persons on and off campus, and developing research plans that are of increasing levels of sophistication. Our objective is to spend our modest funds to accomplish several purposes at once.

Here is where we stand.

1. All the research which has been conducted since 1850 has been reviewed. An article will be forthcoming on this work. It is authored by Dr. Gus Fox of our Bureau of Research. Dr. Fox has identified recurring points of consistency in this research. He finds, for example, that certain categories appear and reappear in the solid studies which have been conducted. These are known to you. He also identifies an unnecessary constraint in our thinking about the goals of our research. He has observed that the result and apparently the objective of teacher effectiveness studies has been to find a "one-cent" means of evaluating teachers. In other words, apparently all studies result in the possibility of mimeographing a rating scale for about a penny and using this instrument to evaluate the complex teaching-learning process. I conclude that no real sustained effort has been made to develop a "nickel" evaluation which I believe we could afford, or even a dollar, or a $250 evaluation. The Carolina Study, as I recall, is perhaps a notable exception to this comment. In this study, the method involved a substantial outlay per teacher, and it was asserted that the money required to conduct the evaluation could better be used to improve the salary level of the teachers.

In any event, it can be argued with considerable support that unnecessary constraint has been placed upon the objectives of prior research. Why not conduct research which assumes we will spend adequate amounts of money to assess the teacher's performance?

Interestingly, while I ask the question and then suggest that we can give a $250 annual evaluation per teacher, I cannot honestly tell you that the evaluation will be either better or as good as the "one-cent" evaluation which he can give himself.

2. The Bureau of Research has developed a teacher-rating scale to be completed by students in the class. This "one-cent" scale does ask for more or less the typical comments found in other rating instruments. Studies are under way to revise and improve it.

Using the scale, we have taken a close look at our teacher preparation program. A survey of *all student teachers* was conducted throughout the academic year. Each student was asked to provide ratings for every course in the professional sequence. In this way, the student's first major experience in teaching provided the basis for his answering questions concerning his professional preparation. The final report presents student reaction to the

relevance of course content, the quality of the equipment, the services rendered by our Instructional Materials Center, and the teaching effectiveness of faculty.

Conferences were held with faculty on a voluntary basis. Interestingly, most faculty participated, and all showed interest in having the research continued. This project, then, contributed to general knowledge and enabled the faculty to make some judgments about courses in the professional education sequence and their own contributions thereto.

This evaluation service is available to other institutions; and, while the methodology is constant, it can be applied to a variety of disciplines.

3. Subsequent to this project, the Bureau of Research has made the rating scale available to all faculty upon request. Approximately 25 percent of the total faculty have requested that their classes be evaluated. The results have been returned to the faculty together with an overall summary of responses. When requested by the faculty, conferences have been held to further understanding through discussion and interpretation. Almost 10,000 copies of the rating scale have been used thus far.

It has been noted that a teacher may instruct students not to reply to certain questions—for example, since he uses the discussion method only, he may ask students not to rate him on questions pertaining to lecturing; it has been noted that a teacher may believe certain items not to apply to himself or to his course. We plan to explore the extent to which this attitude may reveal the teacher's position in relation to teaching.

4. Using a modified form of the Delphi approach, an attempt has been made to uncover a comprehensive and meaningful definition of effective teaching for our campus. The study will be presented in a forthcoming publication. This approach is applicable to many situations.

5. We are proposing to develop alternative schemes of INSTRUMENTATION FOR EVALUATION, including methods of measurement. Thus, with our general objectives we recognize that the problem of evaluating teacher effectiveness is quite complex, that many techniques can be utilized. We need generally accepted standards, individual scales.

While group measurements may be made in certain regards, the problem of identifying a given teacher and reliably differentiating his course performance from another's is complex and difficult. Yet it is crucial if we are to make

progress in improving quality. We hold that the total situation must be defined in relation to understanding any given teaching performance, and that very little is known about interactions within and among the following kinds of domains: community settings, cultural values, family pressures and support, individual motivations, administrative structure and practices, teacher characteristics, student characteristics, equipment, scheduling, course content, and so on. Many pertinent questions can be asked. It is in this field of interactions that research is clearly needed.

To conduct this research we need experimentally to identify the variables which may affect teaching and to explore general possibilities for interaction, and to develop standard instruments and techniques which can reproduce consistently the descriptions of these variables. Hence, our deep interest is instrumentation. Methodology becomes crucial in view of time, place, and subject variables.

6. Goals–It matters little about the conditions of teaching if we don't ask ourselves the purposes of teaching, the role of the teacher, and what we expect to accomplish. We must, therefore, spend considerable time, effort, and money determining the criteria against which we test all of our measurements of teacher effectiveness and the interactions of the various domains and contributions attendant to the attainment of our objectives. We are, therefore, cognizant of the need to search for these criteria in our admittedly complex study, which varies from situation to situation.

Obviously, though much work has been done, we have just scratched the surface locally and nationally. More honestly, we have just begun to chart the dimensions of the surface. It's a big job–challenging, exciting, and somewhat dangerous for professional survival.

By this time, the typical layman should join me in an expression of complete impatience. What on earth have we in the profession been doing all these years? Why is there so much to be done, to be learned? Haven't we been dealing with this whole problem area?

And the response floats back, we have been working on these problems; we know a lot; maybe all we really need is the means to move; perhaps we need one major, sustained effort to tie everything together. More appropriately we may need to recognize that the myriad of teaching-learning situations extant today are dynamic, that times change, that many of today's answers are tomorrow's problems. We do have the capability of making a significant, forward, qualitative thrust in the years ahead by building our actions on the

results of carefully designed, comprehensive research projects. In the forefront of this thrust we will find teacher effectiveness studies. This emphasis assumes that the human factor is paramount. All else falls into line behind this.

We are also cognizant of the fact with respect to instruction that our first job at the university, as at every institution, is to build the obvious conditions of good teaching. We need to keep our good people by paying adequate salaries and having reasonable class sizes. We must enable our faculty to develop the best of relationships with students, and the kinds of teaching situations which will enable students to grow, mature, and learn. We must focus on the job to be done. Too much concern with teacher evaluation or with efforts in improved directions can divert attention, diffuse effort, and undermine morale.

PART FIVE

STUDENT ASSESSMENT IN THE ACCREDITING ACTIVITY

STUDENT ASSESSMENT IN THE ACCREDITING ACTIVITY

Frank G. Dickey

I doubt seriously that there is any more misunderstood or maligned aspect of higher education today than accreditation. As you well know, voluntary accrediting associations have been assailed periodically since their establishment. They have been accused of blackmail, of the protection of mediocrity, of impossible idealism, of cynical loss of idealism, and so on and on.

The simple truth is that voluntary accrediting is a part of the American choice of alternatives. There are other ways to govern and indicate the quality of schools and colleges. Many nations have chosen national ministries of education, and complete control by the national state.

Historically this country was developed and has thrived in the past on the philosophy of laissez faire. The forests were felled, the land cultivated, the mineral resources explored, and business and industrial enterprises created through individual initiative seldom restricted until near the end of the past century by governmental regulations and legal controls. It was only after abuses of the public welfare became so flagrant that the United States Congress officially recognized the situation and adopted legislation providing for some governmental regulations. The first independent federal agency created for this purpose was the Interstate Commerce Commission (1887), followed many years later by the Federal Trade Commission (1914), the Federal Power Commission (1920), the Federal Maritime Commission (1933), the Federal Communications Commission (1934), and the Securities and Exchange Commission (1934).

Although we may disagree with and argue vehemently over some decisions of these and other governmental agencies, not even the Republican Party in its more conservative tangents has proposed that this country could afford, at a time of increasing complexity and a multiplying population, to rely solely on self-regulation. The scandals in cotton and olive oil, the price fixing in the electrical industry, the income tax frauds of judges, the bribery of judges, the convictions of the president of the Teamsters' Union, and the immoral implications of actions of members of the Congress attest to the weaknesses of mankind and the continuing need for some collective control and supervision. The abolition of those agencies of the federal government that assist in the governance of our society is unthinkable despite the fact that there is widespread yearning for the simple and readily comprehended days of the past, untrammeled by governmental controls.

Parallel with the economic and industrial development of the country, higher education expanded as numerous colleges and universities were established and freely chartered by the various states to offer education in nearly any town or hamlet that could raise sufficient funds to induce a church body or other groups to found a college in it. As in business and finance, throughout the nineteenth century higher education was permitted—even encouraged—to expand with few external controls or restrictions. In fact, the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution has consistently been interpreted to prevent the federal government from exercising control over education in a manner commonly practiced in other nations with ministries of education.

In the United States education has truly been a local responsibility, and higher education has met the needs of our society as each institution has been permitted generally to decide for itself how large it will grow, what quality of students it will admit, what requirements it will establish for graduation, and which programs of study it will offer. This freedom of operation has permitted colleges and universities to meet, although sometimes quite belatedly, the needs of our society at the local and regional levels, and incidentally at the national level. But this freedom has also permitted institutions to offer programs of instruction for which many were ill-prepared in personnel, in financial resources, or in physical facilities. By the end of the nineteenth century the result was a pronounced unevenness in academic quality in which a number of colleges offered little more than an advanced secondary school course of study, and in which the majority of the professional schools were operated with attention being given more to the profits for the owners than to the education of the students.

In the case of business, when abuses became too excessive for society to withstand, the federal government enlarged its scope of activities to

counteract these excesses. When good government became threatened by the political bosses, the reform movement during the early part of this century burst into bloom. When higher education required standardization, the public was, perhaps, not competent to initiate the task, and the federal government, despite an attempt of the United States Bureau of Education to issue a public classification of colleges during President Taft's administration, was limited primarily to issuing reports. Since the various states with which legal responsibility for education actually rests were, and still are, most uneven in the execution of their responsibilities, the only hope for the general improvement of higher education rested exclusively with the institutions themselves and with the various professional bodies whose ranks were increasingly being replenished by the graduates of the colleges and professional schools.

To meet the social needs for improved higher education and the individual needs of the better colleges and universities for protection from the competition of unqualified–even dishonest–institutions, associations of the colleges and agencies of the professions initiated the process of accreditation. Ever since, these voluntary, nongovernmental, extra-legal organizations have grown in number and influence. As in the case of the regulatory commissions of the federal government, the accrediting agencies have been subject to criticisms, some of them highly justified. The bases of these criticisms have encouraged some individuals to condemn all external regulations and to claim, as in the case of business, that the nineteenth century concept of the completely free market place should again prevail. Similarly, in the case of accreditation, there are claims uttered frequently enough to warrant rebuttal; namely, that higher education is now sufficiently mature no longer to require any external control and that accreditation should be abolished because, among other factors, it frequently inhibits the institutions from adequately meeting the demands of society.

Whenever controls are established for the purpose of improving minimum standards, regrettably but inevitably there is some restriction on those who are fully capable of employing appropriate judgment and who would conduct excellent programs regardless of the demands of regulating agencies. This latter fact does not imply, however, that society would benefit if educational institutions, for example, were subject to no external supervision and both the excellent, as well as the weak and the dishonest institutions, were permitted to operate unmonitored. The consumer in the market place in our complicated society cannot protect himself from those organized to perpetrate frauds or to distribute goods of shoddy quality.

There is Gresham's Law of economics dating from the sixteenth century

which states that coins of good value are driven out of circulation by coins having equal monetary value but less intrinsic value. A similar principle I think can be applied to education: *As a society places greater value on the attainment of academic degrees, the degrees from colleges and universities whose academic programs are superficial and shoddy will undermine the value of similar degrees from institutions whose educational offerings are excellent.* A nation can no more afford to permit the operation of unqualified colleges and universities than it can permit the circulation of counterfeit money. As one of the two present leading powers in the world, the United States cannot afford to allow either its coinage or its academic degrees to be debased.

It is in this context that colleges and universities, to whom society has assigned the responsibility of their own self-governance, must fulfill their obligations among other steps by improving accreditation–the institutions' primary method of collective regulation.

Problems affecting educational accreditation have been growing in intensity for several years. Recently, the use of accreditation as an eligibility determining mechanism for federal funding and the necessity for an improved system of accountability in education have focused attention on the nation's accrediting agencies and their seeming unwillingness or inability to change the present system to meet all the new local, state, regional, and national needs.

It can be reasonably asserted that the problems have now reached the point where the voluntary approach to quality assurance in education may well be in jeopardy. Unless significant progress can be made in improving the nongovernmental system of accreditation, the Congress and state legislative bodies may revoke the public trust they have tacitly granted the educational community.

The merits of the voluntary approach to standard setting and quality assurance over a governmental system are, I think, sufficient to warrant a strong effort to change and upgrade nongovernmental accreditation to the extent that it once again can adequately serve a dynamic educational system and also the general public.

Problems and Questions Affecting Accreditation

The problems and questions in accreditation revolve around its organization, its growing unwieldiness, some questionable procedures, the criteria, standards, and the uses, effects, and purposes of accreditation.

Until relatively recently, educational accreditation was a concept and procedure reserved mainly for the traditional colleges and universities, secondary schools with emphasis on college preparatory work, and certain specialized and professional programs and curricula. Due to lack of governmental regulation in certain fields, voluntary accreditation has been, or is being, adapted to serve other types and levels of education. Current federal legislation makes use of voluntary accrediting as a means of establishing eligibility for participation in federal funding programs in both the nonprofit and the profitmaking sectors.

New uses for accreditation have served to point out gaps in the system as it currently functions. The fact that no accrediting agency existed to serve a proprietary college of the type of Marjorie Webster Junior College was a prime motivation for the instigation of the Marjorie Webster–Middle States suit. After legislation was enacted affecting distribution of funds to vocational and technical institutions, it was found that there was no system of accreditation to serve these types of nonprofit institutions. The regional associations, though they have been slow to act, have assumed responsibility for schools offering occupational education but their procedures and organization for these purposes are showing wide variances and resulting in considerable confusion on a national basis.

The gaps, the variances in procedures, standards, and organization in voluntary accreditation must be pointed out and changed with considerable deliberate speed to disarm the proponents of systems of federal or state accreditation. Likewise, constructive action is needed quickly to counter the alarming tendency for accreditation grievances to be taken to the courts. This tendency, traceable in large measure to the failure of the voluntary, nongovernmental system to react to public needs for quality assurance in all educational endeavors, is alien to the very concept of self-governance. It could, if unchecked, bring the effective functioning of voluntary accreditation to a virtual halt.

One of the possible new uses which needs to be explored for accreditation is to provide one means of accountability to the public, state and federal government, to private donors, foundations, and consumers. Part of this exploration should include possible relationships between accreditation and national assessment.

One of the claims generally made for voluntary accreditation is that it serves as an effective education improvement device as a result of the self-study, the visiting team evaluation and recommendations, and agency follow-up on these

recommendations. On the other hand, accreditation critics continually pose the general, persistent question of whether accreditation impedes innovation and change in educational programs or whether it might stimulate new ideas and practices. Doubts exist and charges continue; the issue prevails and needs to be resolved.

Probably the most nagging and important question facing accreditation is the validity of the present standards used in the accrediting process–institutional, professional, and specialized. Little is known about the correlations between institutional characteristics and the quality of institutional output; it is even difficult to measure these characteristics and there is scarcely any general agreement as to how to measure the output or even about what should be measured. Certainly, few if any of the standards currently used in accrediting have been framed on the basis of research, and such research is sorely needed.

Many feel that accrediting agencies have swung too far in the "qualitative" direction through the use of very generalized qualitative statements calling for subjective judgments. The time has arrived, many contend, to attempt to construct quantitative indices for use in accrediting, particularly in view of the present ability to handle and analyze vast amounts of data with computers.

The opportunity for meaningful research in this area exists and such studies should be encouraged. Quantities of data, such as those in the files of The American College Testing Program, can be utilized most effectively.

Current standards used for accreditation purposes, it seems to me, have little basis in research, are so general in nature as to be subject to wide interpretation, and have little relevance when applied to institutions ranging from technical institutes to predominantly graduate-level institutions; new standards, based on valid research, are needed by types of institutions, such as technical institutes, junior colleges, liberal arts colleges, and graduate-level institutions.

At this 1970 Invitational Conference it seems most appropriate that consideration be given to the role which the student may play in the accrediting activity. Certainly, if we give more than mere lip service to the idea that the student is the key factor in the learning process, then we should move toward a system of accreditation which would involve student assessment.

When we use the term "student assessment" there are two somewhat different connotations that may be applied to the term. First, we might

assume that we are speaking of the opportunity for the student to express his own feelings and make his own assessment of the institution in which he is pursuing his collegiate work. On the other hand, we might interpret the term to mean the assessment of student progress as he makes his way through the maze of learning activities. It seems to me that both of these interpretations have real validity as parts of the accrediting process.

If the accrediting procedure is to be meaningful and if it is to produce an accurate picture of an institution, its strengths and weaknesses, then we cannot rely solely upon the judgments of a group of administrators and faculty members. We have a real obligation to ask the student to give his frank and honest opinion of the institution, its instructional staff, its curriculum, its services, and the total program of which the student is a vital part.

Most of our accrediting organizations would hold that they attempt to secure such information; however, it is done on such a haphazard, informal basis that I am not sure that we can put much faith in the findings of these efforts. For example, most accrediting visiting teams set up a few meetings with a selected group of students and discuss their perceptions of the institution and its programs; however, the sampling is usually so small and the questions of such a nature that little if any real benefits may be derived. I am, therefore, suggesting that accreditation can be markedly strengthened by the use of instruments designed to obtain and measure student attitudes and opinions about the various aspects of the college or university. We need to know something of the student's feelings about the type of instruction he is receiving. We need to know whether the guidance and counseling he has access to are sufficiently adequate to serve his needs. We need to know whether the institution is actually serving in a responsible manner the perceived needs of its students.

Turning for a moment to the other interpretation of the meaning of the term, "student assessment," let me indicate my own belief that we know far too little about the cognitive development in the college student. Developmental research on college students has tended to focus primarily on noncognitive factors. There are, to be sure, literally thousands of published studies on predicting college grade-point averages. Virtually none of these, however, is concerned with *changes* in cognitive development or with environmental factors that influence cognitive development.

Two recent studies have been concerned with the effects of institutional characteristics on cognitive outcomes. The first of these (Nichols, 1964), involving National Merit Finalists, attempted to assess relative institutional

impact on the Verbal and Quantitative tests of the Graduate Record Examination. Results indicated that institutional factors made little difference, and that most of the predictable variance in GRE aptitude could be attributed to initial differences in freshman aptitude. Although the second study (Astin, 1968) utilized achievement (GRE Area Tests) rather than aptitude measures and a more heterogeneous sample of students, the results were similar. Of particular interest was the finding that student achievement was not enhanced by the traditional indices of institutional quality (select student body, academic competitiveness, high expenditures per student, many PhDs on the faculty, and so forth). While this study cannot be regarded as definitive because of the relative homogeneity of the institutional sample and the small numbers of students per institution, the findings do suggest that certain commonly held assumptions about environmental conditions that favor cognitive development need to be reexamined.

My reason for mentioning such studies is to indicate that many of the so-called standards utilized by the accrediting associations tend to focus on some of the very environmental conditions which appear to have little influence on the cognitive development of students. It would seem to point toward the need for additional research activity in the general area of assessment of student progress. Such activity would either support the present accrediting standards or criteria of excellence or would point to the need for a thoroughgoing revision of the entire scheme of accreditation. My hunch is that the latter would be the outcome. If we do not make moves to develop interaction involving student and environmental variables, then we may find that accreditation as a means of indicating institutional quality will go down the drain.

On the other hand, if such studies can be made in the near future, and if accrediting organizations can be persuaded to use instruments to determine cognitive development of students, the findings could be used both in designing educational experiments and in guiding educational policy and decision-making.

As we look to the future, we must make every effort to shape the accrediting policies to meet the changing conditions which confront us. A cursory reference to the history of education would lead us to the conclusion that accrediting procedures have usually been developed not in anticipation of needs but after they have grown to full maturity. This situation is not singular to accrediting; it is found in all types of social activities and is a phenomenon not likely to be eliminated; however, it would be far better if we could provide the means for easier and more rapid changes in policies and

procedures of accrediting as the needs for change develop. If all of the needs for accreditation are to be served well and effectively, there must be flexibility and yet form within accrediting. Without such flexibility and form, accrediting may well fall of its own dead weight, and its destruction would seriously disfigure education and our national educational welfare. Everyone involved in education and all of those served by education must join hands in the continuing search for answers to these perplexing questions. This is the *least* we can do.

PART SIX

A CASE STUDY IN PRODUCING EQUAL EDUCATIONAL RESULTS: THE THIRTEEN COLLEGE CURRICULUM PROGRAM

A CASE STUDY IN PRODUCING EQUAL EDUCATIONAL RESULTS: THE THIRTEEN COLLEGE CURRICULUM PROGRAM

Elias Blake, Jr.

The Thirteen College Curriculum Program is an attempt to develop teaching strategies and curriculum materials in an area of critical need for equal educational opportunities: The Traditionally Black College. These schools are trying to find programmatic ways to increase the number of college graduates produced out of their over 160,000 enrollment. The program is a freshman studies program involving now over 3,000 students having flowed through an experimental freshman year. The importance of a program like this must be put into its proper context.

The critical relationship between the black college and equal opportunity in higher education is poorly understood; thus, an historical note is in order. Before 1876, it was estimated that 208 Negroes in America had received bachelor's degrees and 96 professional degrees. It is likely that almost all of the 208 came from two black colleges, Lincoln University in Pennsylvania, established in 1854, and Wilberforce in Ohio, established in 1856.

In the period following the Civil War, private colleges for Negroes began to multiply, developed mainly by white religious and philanthropic groups. Most of these colleges incorporated elementary and secondary school programs since half of 488,000 free Negroes, North and South, were illiterate as were almost all of the four million slaves. In 1890, under the second Morrill Land Grant Act, 17 southern states established land-grant colleges for Negroes.

These mechanisms were the budding higher education network for almost all black Americans since 90 percent or more were in the South, and as late as 1940, 77 percent still lived in the South. The figure was 68 percent in 1950 and remained at 53 percent in 1968.

For more than 80 years following 1865, private black colleges supported the bulk of higher education of Negroes in America. No public policies at the state or national level were serious about black people having access to higher education. Up through World War II, basic acceptance of white supremacy in all of America made higher education for "inferior" Negroes a very low priority item.

In 1936, black people reportedly earned 2,108 college degrees. Almost all were from the black colleges. It was 1947 before the baccalaureate degrees awarded in black colleges were divided evenly between public and private schools. There were 8,465 graduates from black colleges in that year, representing still 80 to 90 percent of all black college graduates in the nation. In 1968, 6 of 10 students were enrolled in the public black colleges.

It is clear that for the last hundred years there would have been almost no college graduates among black Americans except for black colleges. These black colleges, now 89 four-year colleges and universities and 23 junior colleges, were and *still are* the foundation stone of much of what is called racial progress in America. Without them, there would be few trained black people to be a part of that "progress."

There is a dangerous mythology now developing that black colleges are anachronistic and not very useful anymore. This is a dangerous and destructive mythology, fed I am convinced by the great publicity attending the inability of major elite institutions to be responsive to small numbers of black students.

In 1968, the black colleges produced 20,000 baccalaureate, graduate, and professional degrees. The 17,000 BA and BS degrees, according to the best available estimates, represent 4 out of 5 of the baccalaureate degrees awarded to black Americans in that year and 7 out of 10 of all levels of degrees.

Yet there are serious problems in the black colleges despite these dramatic figures. The 17,000 baccalaureate degrees represent about 35 to 40 percent of those who enter. The best follow-up studies show that 50 to 55 percent of entering freshmen graduate nationally. In 1968, there were 27,000 degrees awarded from all sources to black Americans. This is about 3.3 percent of the total for 12 percent of the population.

It is clear then that the black college is the most dependable and established source of black college graduates–a source not subject to sharp reversals based on the drying up of "special" pools of funds for "specially" admitted black students. With better holding power rather sharp increases can be made in the number of college graduates among black Americans. It was in this context that the Thirteen College Curriculum Program (TCCP) was developed.

An experimental freshman year program was needed to create a better educational fit in the crucial first year. The students who enroll come from families with a median family income of $3,900 despite more family members working. Thirty-four percent have income below $3,000 a year and in some public colleges as many as 47 percent fall below this figure. About a third of the fathers are laborers and the same proportion of mothers are domestics.

These students also have doubts about their intellectual capabilities. In response to an item, "Sometimes I feel I just can't learn," 42 percent say they agree or are not sure. To an item saying "People like me have more problems succeeding," 44 percent say they agree or are not sure and only 15 percent strongly disagree. In a positive sense they are strongly motivated to succeed; 42 percent say, "I would do almost anything to stay in school." The percentage of answers to this latter response is higher than that in a group of white freshmen in a formerly black college with about half of its entering freshmen now white. Some similar items are also in the Coleman Report on Equality of Educational Opportunity and the negative responses tend to be slightly higher in this population than for those reported by Coleman.

The TCCP then was designed to be responsive to these kinds of students. The program was not, however, to be remedial. The view was taken that remedial courses of the conventional sort are counter productive and probably convince more students that they in fact cannot learn or will never get ahead.

Content materials come from a variety of contemporary sources including black-related materials. These are juxtaposed with more traditional materials in unusual ways to stimulate new ways of looking at "classical" or "standard" sources.

The teaching strategies were designed to reduce the dominance of the teacher in the classroom. Lectures were to be kept at a minimum. Student responses were to be actively stimulated and encouraged.

A basic strategy was the use of workshops to involve experienced teachers in

the process of creating materials and techniques. This is a slower process for program development. It gives the assurance, however, that not only will students respond but teachers can and will teach the courses as they develop. We consciously rejected the conventional "course development" approach to curriculum development and took on an entire freshman year including English, social science, science, and mathematics. In addition, two courses were developed in humanities and philosophy for the second year.

In terms of dropouts and academic achievement at the end of two years, 76 percent of the entering group completed a full two years of college as compared to 56 percent of a group of controls. In terms of academic achievement in their work outside of the special program, the level of achievement of the 76 percent was equal to that of the smaller 56 percent in the control group.

In terms of achievement test performance we have found significant differences only on a test of verbal ability and no results over two years in favor of those enrolled in the special program. In the first year the students in the special program viewed their college environment as having a stronger "scholarship" press. The College and University Environment Scales were used for this purpose.

From the survey of Interpersonal Values we have found a consistent difference in the valuing of independence in favor of those in the TCCP. Correspondingly there is also a consistently greater decrease in the valuing of conformity.

There are some suggestive findings that the students in the TCCP have attained more positions of leadership in the student culture. We are following this up in a more systematic manner. The better students have acquired a reputation of being more "alert" and "inquiring" among nonprogram teachers on some campuses.

From the student point of view the use of black-related materials stamps the program as relevant and useful in an analysis of contemporary problems. This too is based on interviews which, though not systematic, have covered all campuses. The dominant feature of the program is the opportunity "to express oneself," to look at things from your own point of view versus just memorize from the books. A problem among their peers on some campuses in the early part of the year is the sense that they are in an "easy" program and will be behind. This perception is based partly on a pattern of out-of-class

preparation involving little memorization and cramming before examinations. The nature of their classroom activities using a great deal of inductive analysis seems related to this difference.

The intent is to follow the first group for five years or one year beyond college to look at not only their graduation rate but also their pattern of major field preparation and career choices.

This paper has emphasized the student development based on a demonstration project. The TCCP operates in an institutional context that must make room for change. Though it will not be discussed in any depth, institutional responsiveness is the key issue. ISE's ability to implant a change-agent program in the regular structures will make the difference. This component of curriculum innovation is too often ignored. Thus, the bookshelves literally groan with innovative courses and approaches accumulated since the late 1950s. Educational practice, especially in higher education, has ignored it all. Generally, the innovators take no responsibility for installation. ISE does. There are signs of lasting change, but it is slow, difficult work with few precedents.

As a representative group of the traditionally black colleges, the students with which we have been working are a part of the great unfinished business of American higher education. Beyond the black students are the Mexican-Americans, Indians, Puerto Ricans, and Appalachian whites, some of whom are less well represented in higher education than black youth, mainly due to the existence of the black colleges.

The great unfinished business is equality of attainment, not just opportunity. How do you get people, who are poor, black, or both, into and through college and on into the professions in their correct proportions.

The magnitude of what needs to be can be viewed from the perspective of the problems of black youth.

1. In 1968, there was a deficit of 500,000 blacks enrolled in higher education.

2. In 1969, still only about half as many black freshmen as is their proportion of 17-year-olds were enrolled in college (90,000 versus 180,000).

3. In 1969, despite the great seeming splurge of increasing enrollments, the

proportion of blacks in college did not go beyond 6 percent, the same level as in 1968.

4. If there is to be a catch-up effort, there should be a tripling of the number of black freshmen enrolling by 1975.

5. To increase the magnitude of the problem, nonwhite 3-year-olds are 16.6 percent of that age group. That means that the 1982 freshman class should have that percentage of blacks in it at least.

A great debate is raging about how best to deal with this problem in a basically elitist higher education establishment. Much of the debate is fueled by the doubtful commitment of college faculties to teaching poor youth. As the pressure increases, I predict the faculty backlash will increase. Too few faculties are taking *instructional* responsibility for black youth entering white colleges. On most campuses the "special" students are in "special" programs with "special" personnel.

The junior college approach to black youth will also become unacceptable unless junior colleges show a much better transfer pattern to four-year colleges. Their track record to date is very poor and this is before the arrival of black youth.

In the meantime, the black colleges do what they must, make college graduates, not just enrollees, out of the survivors of the obstacles of racism and its attendant poverty and discrimination.

Note that there are 4.4 million nonwhites between the ages of 10 and 17. They are already in a failing school system and beyond the reach of Headstart or follow-through. Those who argue that the first five years are crucial had best start calculating the effect of the post-five-year groups on the social order. An emphasis on the first five years that produces neglect, benign or otherwise, of older children and youth is a very, very great calculated risk.

The country needs positive examples of alternatives to the first-five-year strategy. The basic reason is that there should be 1.8 million nonwhites in college in 1982. If the black colleges tripled their enrollment to 500,000, they would enroll only about 28 percent of the black youth in college. It is mandatory that their enrollments expand and their dropout rates decrease in the next five years. If not, it is doubtful that the expansion of enrollments will occur. This reasoning points to the central importance of efforts such as the Thirteen College Curriculum Program. Such a program operates on a faith

in the future. Faith is hard to sell in this trying period when black people feel that their status as citizens is being allowed to drift backward. And that many proposals such as preventive detention and pre-arrest fingerprinting and photographing are but thinly veiled preludes to massive repression. The precision with which 900 black college students in Mississippi were jailed adds to the unease.

Despite all of that, positive alternatives are still the name of the game and with a reorganization of priorities that allows equal institutional development opportunities for black colleges, some positive alternatives can be developed where the largest single concentrations of black youth are.

A continuing ignorance about and an ignoring of the traditionally black colleges which enroll over 160,000 black youth and graduate over 20,000 persons a year could well result in very serious confrontations with black youth about their educational aspirations.

In another ISE study, we found that 64 percent of 80 black senior federal officials graduated from black colleges, including James Farmer, Assistant Secretary of HEW (Wiley College); Elizabeth Koontz, Director of the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor; and Robert J. Brown, Special Assistant to the President. I note these persons because they are recent appointments of President Nixon.

A Ford Foundation study showed that 74 percent of a sampling of black PhDs in all fields took their baccalaureate degrees in black colleges.

Thus, I end as I began by indicating that if unequal educational and economic status for blacks is to end, the developing programs in black colleges are of great significance to the nation.

PART SEVEN

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

David D. Henry

Sir Winston Churchill said, "There is nothing wrong with change, if it is in the right direction." All of us would wish for some sure way to know the proper direction before policy decisions are made. We live in an age of such rapid change and growth that often more attention is given to the process itself than to the new objectives or even the directions.

Higher education is today being attacked for excessive traditionalism and hesitancy to innovate and experiment. The hue and cry of some student and faculty educational reformers leaves the broad impression that nothing is right and that there is some inherent virtue in change.

The recently issued Carnegie Commission report, "A Chance to Learn: An Action Agenda for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education," pointed out that this country offers the opportunity for postsecondary education to over 40 percent of the college-age population, a proportion far greater than that of any other nation. "Never in history," the Commission states, "has any other nation moved so far and so fast in providing expanded opportunities for higher education." The system has a detailed interplay with our productive economy. It makes an important contribution to socioeconomic mobility. Colleges and universities provide public and cultural leadership, and they represent an autonomous social unit for reason and reflection, inquiry and criticism. American higher education is the model for much of the world; we are doing many things correctly, and some things very, very well.

There are negative facets of these positive functions. Obviously, there is room for improvement. We need not, and should not, however, throw everything out and start anew. To combat the difficulties, and to add new elements, we must begin by subjecting to the most careful analysis what has been, and is still, working. If we overreact, if we proceed with a lack of precision, with a lack of scholarship and with an advocacy of change without well-rooted experimentation and analysis, we will then destroy much of what might be a solid foundation for future developments.

In academic circles, unfortunately, the history of self-assessment and studied change is not glorious. Charles Frankel reminds us that "most men's recognition of the need for reform grows in direct proportion to the distance of the proposed reform from their own territory." Eric Ashby's observation of academics in Great Britain is not without relevance to our own institutions:

> All over the country these groups of scholars, who would not make a decision about the shape of a leaf or the derivation of a word or the author of a manuscript without painstakingly assembling the evidence, make decisions about admissions policy, size of universities, staff-student ratios, content of courses, and similar issues, based on dubious assumptions, scrappy data and mere hunch . . . although dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge, they have until recently resolutely declined to pursue knowledge about themselves.

Knowledge about ourselves, in this age of institutional interaction with social concerns, in many ways involves knowledge about the major problems confronting our society. The urgency that is felt about deriving solutions for these massive challenges tempts us away from scholarly analysis and careful planning. At times, it seems that shouting has replaced discussions, marching is a substitute for debate, and sloganeering drowns out rational discourse. The great successes of our colleges and universities after World War II built exaggerated expectations into the public—they overestimate our capacity, our capability and underestimate our time requirements and misjudge our role. We ourselves suffer similar uncertainties. Many of our objectives are vague, and several of them, when analyzed, are contradictory.

Nonetheless, the relationship of our colleges and universities to the fulfillment of national needs has become widely accepted. The Carnegie Commission summarized them in its first report, which called for new levels of federal responsibility for the financing of higher education.

> More and more Americans, with aspirations for a better life, assume the necessity of a college education.

Equality of opportunity through education, including higher education, is beginning to appear as a realistic goal for the less privileged young members of our society.

The economy is dependent upon basic research and advancing technology, and upon the higher skills needed to make that technology effective, to assure national economic growth and well-being.

More managers, teachers, and professionals of all sorts are required to serve our complex society. More health personnel are essential to staff the fastest-growing segment of the national endeavor.

The cultural contributions of higher education take on wider dimensions as rising levels of education and growing affluence and leisure make possible greater concern with the quality of life in the United States.

Above all, the nation and the world depend crucially upon rigorous and creative ideas for the solution to profoundly complex issues.

The recent academic unrest and discontent and the growing public skepticism concerning accountable returns for their sizable investment in higher education have not lessened society's dependence upon the system. The Lou Harris poll of March 26, 1970, indicates that the public still gives first priority within federal spending to aid to education. Yet we are also facing what F. Champion Ward, Vice President of the Ford Foundation, identifies as the crisis of efficiency and support, the crisis of relevance and control, and the crisis of race and class. The greater public investment in and demand of higher education, on the one hand, and the greater skepticism and call for accountability on the other, are moving our colleges and universities on what David Riesman calls a "collision course."

During this decade, we shall probably witness an increase in the urgency of social problems pressing upon higher education. Equal opportunity, the quality of the environment, health-related services, urban affairs—these interests seem to expand in complexity with each month. If higher education is to help meet the problems associated with them, it must be allowed to do so within the strengths of its own talents and resources. Irving Kristol concludes on this point: "The collective responsibility of the university is education. That is its original mission, that is its original purpose, that is the only thing it can claim expertise or authority for. To return to this original purpose, with renewed seriousness, would be an action at once radical and constructive."

I would underline this conviction with the view that the politicalization of the university can bring nothing but confusion, loss of credibility, and, ultimately, repression.

The assessment of the functions of higher education–sketched in the earlier quotation from the Carnegie Commission's first report–has been carried out by different parties within and outside of the system. The faculty assesses the students, the students assess the faculty, and the public assesses the entire operation. Clark Kerr warns that moving the constituents of higher education toward meaningful assessment will be a treacherous journey. He continues:

> The territory is largely uncharted, but we do know that it is inhabited by dragons who do not wish it to be explored too thoroughly; who look upon cost-benefit analysis as the work of a foreign devil; who want to be left alone with their cherished habits; who prefer to be unstudied, unevaluated; who think no one can understand them except themselves and they do not even want to understand themselves; and who think that to study them–as with some primitive tribe–is to change them, perhaps in ways they do not wish to be changed–and they are right. At the same time, they want more and more support from the external world. The two desires, unfortunately, are not fully compatible.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, of which Dr. Kerr is Chairman and Executive Director and of which I am privileged to be a member, is supporting a number of projects related to new effort at assessing our colleges and universities. Among them are studies of:

The attitudes of students, faculty, and staff members to their academic environments, by Professors Martin Trow at Berkeley and Seymour Lipset at Harvard.

The reaction of young alumni to their college experiences, by the National Opinion Research Center.

The economic consequences, and related questions concerning the return to the educational investment, by the National Bureau of Economic Research.

The rate of return of higher education and the relationship between differences in income and educational attainment, by Professor Richard Eckhaus at MIT.

Econometric models to determine the effects of alternative politics, by Professor Roy Radner at Berkeley and Leonard Miller at Stony Brook.

The social and political consequences of higher education, by the Institute of Social Research at the University of Michigan.

The efficient use of resources, by the Institute of Policy Analysis at the Irvine campus of the University of California.

The labor market adjustments to increasing levels of higher education in the work force, by a team directed by Professor Lloyd Ulman of the Institute for Industrial Relations at Berkeley.

Internal educational policy, by Professor Dwight Ladd of the University of New Hampshire

Past and present data concerning the comparative effectiveness of different types of institutions of higher education, by Robert Berls of the United States Office of Education.

The comparative effectiveness of higher education systems in various countries, by Professor Joseph Ben-David at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

The Chairman has outlined additional areas, where studies need to be and perhaps can be made:

What is happening to the productivity of higher education in training, research, and service?

How effective is the talent hunt throughout the total population of entrance age?

What is the "value added" to students—in terms of income, life quality, and citizenship performance—of different types of campuses; and as against the comparative costs of the value added?

What proportion of the GNP ideally should be spent on higher education?

What is the quality of the commentary upon and criticism of the total society by the academic community?

Recent developments relating both to the procedures and to the results of attempts at assessment have not been encouraging.

- Many of the projects concerning the fundamental questions of evaluation have had to establish their own definitions and data sources in the absence of earlier studies.

- The number and range of publics concerned with the assessment of higher education has multiplied, with varying premises and purposes.

- Alexander Astin, Director of Research at the American Council of Education, finds little evidence of a differential impact of the individual campus. Related studies on the impact of colleges upon their students conclude, as Clark Kerr reviewed them, that "colleges serve mainly to intensify the original inclinations of students–students select a compatible college, a compatible subculture within it and a compatible field of academic study, and come out the way they went in, only more so, and stay that way the rest of their lives."

- The Executive Vice President and Provost of the University of Illinois, Lyle H. Lanier, raised several questions about the trend toward program budgeting.

> Much has been made of the potentialities of the "PPB" method for improving educational planning and administration. It involves an application of so-called "systems analysis" to institutional operations, including the evaluation of the effectiveness of present and proposed programs in terms of stated objectives and "cost-benefit" relationships. The general approach appears to be promising in certain respects, and several universities–including the University of Illinois–are attempting to adapt it for special administrative purposes. But great difficulties arise in the specification of significant program characteristics and in securing the information needed to measure effectiveness.

I would like to identify nine areas important in future assessment of higher education.

1. Institutional mission. The day is past when any one university can be all things to all people. Each must cultivate its unique combination of resources and move toward division of labor with others, instead of duplication of energy. Conflicts and confusions arise when one institution or agency attempts to perform every function. Interinstitutional coherence and cooperation must replace the collection of completely sovereign units.

There must be a wholly different set of mechanisms and criteria for assessing the roles and the functions of an individual institution and its constituent parts. There are areas where systemwide measurements or standards have little relevance to a single college or university (for example, the portion of the Gross National Product devoted to higher education *versus* the size and distribution of an institutional budget). We should avoid the risk of applying these generalizations from national discussions with equal force to the institution (another example would be the diverse responsibilities for expanding educational opportunities).

2. Long-range planning. Planning involves many elements—growth, change, and accretion. We have made the least progress in establishing structures and criteria for determining priorities in a time of limited resources. What is the least disruptive method for restructuring? What specific criteria can be developed for equitably and efficiently handling obsolete programs? And what is obsolescence in curricular matters? Many people have the impression that we are doing things that we need not do. But how is this conclusion reached?

Public concern tells us that high priority in the 1970s will be given to the solution of problems related to adequate health care, environment control, equality of opportunity, and urban affairs. The forward-looking institution will relate its research, instruction, and public service capability to these subjects. At the same time, old priorities persist. How will scarce resources be allocated? Will the assessment include a weighting of the human spirit, as well as of the human stomach? In the cry for relevance, is poetry dead? How shall the answer be determined?

3. Demography. The demand for admissions and the demographic conditions during the 1970s and 1980s will affect the planning and the assessment of an institution's future. We have indications that the enrollment pressures will decrease within 15 years although the percentage of the college-age population attending postsecondary schools may increase. Many public and private institutions are facing presently a delay in capital expansion. Combined with a federal cutback in this area, higher education may find that it is losing ground in the provision of facilities needed even before the demands for admission begin to level off. The Carnegie Commission is drafting a special report concerning "New Places for the Seventies."

4. Supply of professional personnel. Every institution will respond to the changing supply and demand within the professions. While there is always a shortage of highest quality professionals, various areas will experience different degrees of under- or oversupply. The federal cutback in support of graduate study will have an important bearing upon the emphasis and direction chosen by each institution as it responds to manpower requirements.

5. Student economics. The changing philosophy of financial support, which is shifting the burden of educational costs from the institutions to the student, threatens the expansion of educational opportunities. We cannot yet fully assess the effects of increasing charges to students, particularly the impact at the graduate level, but it seems clear that a loan fund approach

could increase the barriers to educationally disadvantaged and middle-income students. Those who are able to continue their education will do so by incurring indentures upon future resources.

6. Finance. The quality of public and private higher education is being threatened by the present financial exigencies. This situation is not generally understood; in fact, many people do not believe that it exists. New case studies of private institutions show that they are eating into their capital resources in order to maintain their present educational programs while public institutions are receiving shorter rations with which to carry disproportionate increases in costs.

7. External controls. Increased surveillance by accrediting agencies and by state and federal authorities will constitute a continuing burden upon colleges and universities. Despite the fine and important work contributed by several professional groups, there is evidence that pressures are increasing toward control instead of counsel. With the additional machinery in each state, the momentum toward control cannot help but affect the private as well as the public institutions.

8. Admissions and equal opportunity. Flowing with the concept of division of responsibilities within higher education would be a scheme of educational opportunity which cultivates the diversity of student purpose, concern, and capability. In an ideal system, with sensitive testing apparatus and adequate primary and secondary school preparation, each student would be placed in an institution and in a program according to his motivation, aptitude, and interest. If this is not feasible, we can certainly come closer to it than we are today. Such an objective would be central to the purposes of the student and the involved institutions. The tendency for each institution to conform on all aspects of admissions represents a trend toward the lowest common denominator.

Aware of the problems here raised, the Carnegie Commission recommended a comprehensive program for improving opportunity for higher education. The Commission drew an important distinction between "open admissions" and "universal access," which Fred Hechinger underscored in his summary for the *New York Times.*

> . . . the Commission recommended that each state provide universal access to its total system, but not necessarily to each of its institutions. This distinction is crucial. It answers the irrational demands of the radicals and the irrational fears of the conservatives. It acknowledges that the quality of institutions is indeed affected by the quality of the students it admits; but it protects students' opportunities and institutions' quality by creating different tiers of educational purpose and rigor.

9. Student participation in assessment. We are now experiencing the ramifications of not providing in an earlier period for the meaningful involvement of students in the educational assessment process. Presently we are groping for objectives and suffering from false premises and assumptions as to the nature of the potential contribution.

Student judgments have always influenced the evolution of educational theory and practice. Charles Frankel points out that students have affected the climate, curriculum and character of the teaching staff, the rules of campus life, and the composition of future student bodies, without the benefit of formal representation. The students elect courses of study, professions, instructors, institutions, and residences, and in maintaining such consumer functions they have a significant hand in shaping the direction and the development of our colleges and universities. Machinery for appropriate direct involvement can be equally productive.

In the current pressure to formalize and expand student participation in every area of the campus activities, it will be as destructive to issue a blanket acceptance of representation as it is dangerous to continue a total exclusion. I am strongly in favor of a student voice in each assessment procedure where their experience and competence make their representation relevant to the issues at hand. This is particularly important at the departmental level.

I have listed nine areas where institutional response will affect the effectiveness of higher education in the decade ahead. They are not the total which might be listed and weighting among them in the assessment of the future of higher education would vary among commentators. There is one overriding element in assessing the future, however, and our capacity to deal with it will affect the nature and effectiveness of higher education in the next decade. I refer to the public attitude toward students, faculty, and institutional performance.

Earlier we spoke of Champion Ward's three crises. His colleague at the Ford Foundation, Mitchell Sviridoff, observed in the Foundation's last annual report that "the single most serious breakdown in the society is not that of law and order, crime in the streets, education, housing, or any of the other usual subjects of current debate. Rather, it is one of confidence in the ability of the society to meet the challenges of the time. There is a rising feeling that the system is not up to it." And Charles Frankel illustrates the link between this general breakdown of confidence and the crisis of legitimacy in higher education. "... the credit on which our system draws when it asks for allegiance, the reservoir of trust and confidence into which a government dips

when it asks for obedience to law and order, are leaking away. We are living through the deepest kind of political crisis—what can be called a 'crisis of legitimacy.' It is not possible to insulate universities from such a crisis—universities least of all: they have usually been the first places to register the existence of such a crisis."

The headlines on education these days tend to fill the mind with images of discord, dissension, and management uncertainty as to goals and objectives. Confrontations, disruptions, and incidents of anti-intellectual behavior do occur on campuses as they do in communities everywhere. They are a part of our time and are neither any more nor any less serious than comparable incidents in other segments of American life. They do indeed pose problems of administration and command a tragic loss of creative energy and time. Their handling is a proper public concern.

When we examine the extraordinary volume of higher education's activities from a broader perspective, however, we cannot help but observe the constructive innovations being carried out by the effective efforts of highly dedicated people. Our colleges and universities merit the confidence of the citizens and ask for their enlarged interest in and understanding of the mission which they have to perform. Those who talk about academic bureaucracy and impersonalization simply lack perspective on the true meaning of higher education. Every activity and every undertaking is geared to the improvement of the quality of life of people now living and those to come.

The institutions themselves must share in the task of enlarging public understanding of their work, both by direct public interpretation of their programs and functions and by cooperative movements to develop common policies when this is desirable, by intensive self-analysis, and by supporting state or regional patterns *based upon sound analysis of differential institutional function as the only rational means of serving the quantitative and qualitative needs of this country.*

In general, citizens are not familiar with the intricacies of federal finance or with the equities of federal involvement in higher education. It is clear, furthermore, that unless citizens raise their voices, highways, welfare, and defense expenditures, important as they are, will have a higher priority than the complex needs and opportunities in the higher education segment of public service. A problem of the 1970s is to make clear the public interest in the service colleges and universities can supply and to translate that interest to the Congress and other government leaders.

While the course of higher education's progress in the future is obscured by the climactic problems with which we must deal in our time, we may be reassured that what the university has to offer people and communities, states and nation, is desperately needed, and such need is bound to be fulfilled. Hence, we may face the future with confidence in the high destiny of the university as a central force in the life of society and a large influence in the national welfare.

Public expectations and evaluations will increase, and our institutions must respond with confidence and with clarity. We can maintain a system open to examination and to change, and emerge from the increased scrutiny and pressures with greater stability and with even greater potential for education and for public service.

PART EIGHT

INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY AND EFFECTIVENESS

INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY AND EFFECTIVENESS

O. Meredith Wilson

A physician who finds someone dreadfully disturbed prescribes a sedative. For someone who is lethargic he prescribes something to stimulate. In dealing with people and problems the least satisfactory time to stir up emotions is a period of high perturbation. The time to start stirring emotions is in the period of quiescence. When there is a fire, more than anything else people need to have familiar ground recalled to them. To save themselves they will then know how to take advantage of what they know.

I consider this a time of perturbation, a time of fire. I do not think that those who are deeply aggrieved should be asked to be silent. I do not believe that people who see great injustice should be asked to scream less loudly. I do believe that on occasion someone needs to point out the familiar ground, the appropriate institutions, and what we have that's worth saving, in order that in the process of finding justice for some, we don't destroy the possibility of having effective institutions for all.

In consequence, this paper will seem quiet. It begins by traversing the land that each of you already knows and ends with a definition with which, at one time at least, all of you would have agreed. Yet, it does seem to me that walking familiar ground is important at the present time.

At the opening of this century something like fifty thousand young men and women were enrolled in American colleges and universities. By 1975, we expect eight million. Then, fewer than one in ten of our high school graduates continued. By 1975, more than one in two will seek post-high school

instruction. Then, the collegiate population was evenly divided among men and women. During the great depression, this balance was lost; men outnumbered women by more than two to one.

The explanation is easy to find. At the turn of the century, college was the resort of an elite who might see education as different for son than for daughter, but the families could afford to provide for both.

By 1935, education was seen as more than a finishing experience for the well-to-do. It was perceived as a place for professional development and a means for upward mobility. Families that had to watch their budgets carefully saw college as important for their children. But if funds forced a choice among children, education for a son took first priority.

Change in sex balance in collegiate population serves as an interesting indicator of the shifts in our perception of education and in the use of our institutions by a different or expanded segment of our social structure.

The shift from an assumption that collegiate education was an elitist privilege to the idea that a college education was not only an appropriate aspiration but also a functional necessity for all classes was completed with the help of the GI Bill, and the educational subventions which were given GIs during the 10 years following World War II.

The consequences in altered expectations of college students has forced a change in college curriculum, parietal regulations, admissions machinery, placement obligations, and instruction. We have frequently puzzled about the effects of increased numbers. We have not so frequently recognized that the character, background, and expectations of the typical student are radically different from those in the times past and affect our colleges as radically as do the increased numbers.

The GI was older. He had faced ultimate problems. He was prepared to use the faculty and the curriculum to his own ends, but the college rivalries and school spirit were part of a make-believe life, a mock conflict for boys. These were men who had already been to war.

The years of the GI were busy and businesslike years on college campuses. Men moved at their own pace—a fast one—toward their own objectives, and as should be expected of men clear about their goals, they made rapid progress.

The typical GI was not passive. He was driven by a need to catch up with the years he had lost in conflict. He was driven by the growing demands of a

growing family, by a wife who wanted out of the transplanted barracks in which the college housed them.

On the other hand, he was not characterized by the internal conflict or doubt which, as opposed to passivity, is often classed by our academic psychologists as the necessary condition for education and change.

And for me, at least, there is a lesson here. Inner conflict and turmoil may be preconditions to change as measured by a psychologist, for it gives the psychologist some mending to do. But a stable personality who knows what he wants to be and says he knows he wants to be an historian and is impatient to get on with the learning has enough preconditions for me.

To paraphrase Farragut at Mobile Bay, with such a student I can say, "Damn the psychologists and full speed ahead." The real business of university personnel, faculty and students, is learning and if it can be had without head splitting, or window breaking, or arson, or even exchanges of obscenities–okay. I am so little a masochist that I can even be content with peaceful progress.

The GIs by their maturity altered the college scene perceptibly, and the alteration persisted after they had gone. But their effect on the pool from which future students were to be drawn has had more radical consequences for university life than did their short episode as incumbents.

The GI was indoctrinated with the promise of education by his officers. His field service was a period of exposure to some of the most dramatic artifacts of modern science. Each military company was a fairly random collection of Americana, mingling in the same life and death enterprises former college students, farm hands, men who took college education to be their natural lot, and men who had never aspired to collegiate learning. It collected them at the same mess, or in common rest retreats and hospitals.

They were taught that the science training specialized skills were useful during and after service, and when they were mustered out, the GI Bill of Rights made the cost of education no barrier to any of them. Thousands of men who might never have considered the possibility not only gained an appetite but they also had the means to satisfy the appetite for education. And they infected their younger siblings, and their own children, with the educational virus.

Since 1955, there has scarcely been a segment of our society that believed the university was beyond its horizon. What the Land Grant Act of 1862 had

begun, the GI Bills completed. By 1955, the United States, in educational aspirations at least, had become an open society.

The rapid increase in college enrollment is evidence enough of that change. Occasionally I have heard colleagues speak of numbers as though they were a threat. Quality, they say, is certain to decline. And yet the fact is that anyone who believes in education and who has any affection for his fellows must be delighted, for men who formerly would have been doomed to remain uncultivated are invited into the world of learning.

The common figure of speech makes of college "a reservoir of knowledge." President Lowell explained the metaphor. He said, "The freshmen brought so much in and the seniors took so little out." However you explain it, the metaphor is imperfect and unfortunate. It suggests a finite pool whose waters are exhausted as they flow out to sweeten the lives they serve, so that if many more drink from the waters, each must drink less; whereas, like the widow's oil of gospel fame, the pool of knowledge is self-renewing, waiting undiminished for anyone who thirsts.

That's a fairly purple bit of language, and a bit extravagant, too, but I like it because it is a corrective for the elitist prejudices. And it expresses an ideal toward which an open society should stretch itself.

But education at college is not so simple as drinking. And, until now at least, it requires the services of intermediaries whom we call teachers. Since the energy of a school teacher is limited, and since personal interaction between student and teacher is essential, numbers do affect quality and cannot be disregarded as we try to increase effectiveness.

Quality education is frequently identified with Socratic dialogue. Purists have been heard to insist that nothing good can happen in classes that exceed 15. And romantics repeat with nostalgic approval James Garfield's alumni day tribute to his greatest teacher. It is not enough to tell you that even nostalgia is not the same any more. Actually, James Garfield on one end of a log and Mark Hopkins on the other was university enough for James Garfield. But we have persisted strangely in hearing the wrong lesson in that remark. Garfield's enchantment was not with the one-to-one student-teacher ratio. Had you given Garfield the choice, on the one hand, of sharing his end of the log with other students as he listened to Mark Hopkins, or, on the other, of retaining lone possession of his end of the log, but accepting a substitute for Mark Hopkins, he would surely have said, "I choose Hopkins." His point was the importance of being exposed to a great mind. The log and the aloneness were but ways to focus attention on the crucial element in education—the

opportunity to observe a great mind at work.

Now the students come to us with so many different backgrounds and with such differing aspirations, we must be doubly careful not to betray ourselves and them. We can be misled too easily by stereotypes and cliches.

For example, at the height of our concern about numbers, I was asked to share the platform with a distinguished educator who presided over a private college. She was to speak of quality and I of mass education. One is usually predisposed to respond to the signals given, so I might have tried to respond as directed. But there is no such thing as mass education.

Masses can be swayed, aroused, directed. Education is a personalized cooperative enterprise, highly individualized and dependent upon the learner for most of the effective energy. When instead of a homogeneous class totaling fifty thousand we find ourselves confronted with eight million composed of heterogeneous groups, we cannot speak of education as a unitary task. We cannot afford to devise a single method designed to bring a particular class to a single goal.

Here the misused word "relevance" has genuine meaning. The means, the level of complexity, the rigor, the objectives of education must be personalized, tailored to the measure of the child of parents who never knew high school or college; to the child whose preparation is compromised because English was a second language; to the third world child whose anger, unless it is mitigated by thoughtful care, may stand in the way of his growth; to the alienated children of the well-to-do who may be bright enough but have not learned discipline and may be stopped from learning, and prevent others from learning as well by their intransigence; to the well-adjusted and matured student who knows his objectives and would like to have the facilities of the university available for use now.

These may include the not so bright and the very bright, and there should be provision for each to grow at his own speed. Moreover, we should question the curious assumption that if he is happy to work toward constructive goals, he must be sick.

Sometime in the early fifties we developed a national appetite for excellence. Prestigious colleges by using aptitude tests limited their admissions to the upper 5 percent. Quality became an obsessive concern, but emphasis was placed on the caliber of the student admitted, not the effectiveness of the educational experience provided.

I am sure a careful study would reveal a high correlation between intellectual potential of student bodies and the intellectual power of their faculties.

Nevertheless, the attention has been paid to the quality recruited rather than to the changes effected in the recruits, and as Plato remarked, "What is honored in a country will be cultivated there, and will be studied, and will be understood."

Is it surprising that we know more about the characteristics of the students at entry than we do about the changes effected in them during their college year, or about the changes we should make in them, or how to effect the desired changes.

In our default we have invested great faith in the peer group influence. If bright students visit with bright students, however unstructured the circumstances, bright consequences will follow. I hope you will forgive me if I confess uneasiness in the presence of such simple faith.

The uneasiness arises naturally from my background. My father was wont to deplore too much time spent in bull sessions, with peers on the street, at the corner drug store, or in the pool hall. Why rap sessions are better, even if held in the dormitory lounge, is unclear to me. Peers can mull their prejudices, their aspirations, exchange their experiences, but they cannot reach beyond what they know, nor higher than their own experiences, and may not rise above their own Caliban impulses unless challenged by more experienced minds, and enriched by some externalized expression of higher aspirations.

And there does seem to me some evidence that overreliance on peer group instruction has permitted some promising groups to go to seed—some say to pot—and to espouse extremes that more reasoned analysis would not justify.

The young, without colleges, would still assemble in peer groups. Our social nature ensures that they would do so. They come to age 18 filled with wonder and discontent. They hate the war and particularly the hypocrisy that surrounds it, and are disposed to charge every established agency with complicity. The university becomes the focus of their anger because they are gathered there in large enough numbers to become a self-conscious class. They are collected into what may be considered a mass of critical size. They come from poor homes, rich homes, black homes and brown homes; they come from stable homes and broken homes; they bring their anger at war, their distress about discrimination, their indignation that people are hungry in a world of affluence; they bring their sexual drives and their experimental interest in drugs; they bring in their cultural carpetbags, their addiction to four-letter words, and their good and their bad manners as they gather together.

Whether their rap sessions, if unaffected by anything other than their youth, energy and anxiety, would emphasize the positive, is for each of us to judge.

But being young they would come together anyway, and they would bitch and blow about the world if there were no college.

What we should ask is: What does the collegiate environment add, and what should it add? And whatever you may decide about how to measure the quality of an institution, the effectiveness will be revealed by a measure of what has been added to the individuals in these natural groups, how far toward socially accepted goals the selected students may have moved as a result of the collegiate experience.

Change may be needed, but change commensurate with the mission of a university is what we must seek. The measure is that change which is required is change that is made in the direction for which the university exists. There may be some different perceptions of what a university exists for. I offer my own, not so that I may preempt the field, but to stimulate and give direction to your discussion.

The laws of the university's nature are the principles of scholarship and the methods of science. The instrument for action is the mind. The objectives are understanding, or knowing more of, what is true, or good, or beautiful, or wise.

In pursuit of these goals, the scholar may erect an hypothesis and devise ingenious ways to test it. If he makes the mistake of falling in love with his presuppositions, the rules of scholarship will intervene. These rules for the academic man apply wherever he may be found, for the object of the academic search is truth; and truth will yield itself to plodding perseverance; occasionally to the sagacious leap or an inspired guess; always without special regard for nation or creed or class; but it never yields itself to dishonesty and seldom to prejudgment.

A Lisenko may develop a theory of biological development to fit a dogma, and he may contrive evidence to support his contrivance, but nature is recalcitrant. The rules by which science gains on ignorance, and which represent the constitution and the bill of rights in the republics of learning, are the same everywhere.

Alexandr D. Alexandrov, Professor of Mathematics at Novosibrisk, speaks of them no differently than would an Englishman or a midwestern American. He says:

> Science demands unconditional honesty, it does not allow any distortion of facts, nor any tricks in reasoning, a distorted fact is not a scientific fact, logical trickery is not a scientific means of inference.

I would stress two more characteristic features of the spirit of science–its active optimism and its persistent search for truth. Optimism of science consists in the belief that any problem that science is or may be confronted with can, sooner or later, be solved. The optimism encourages the persistence of the search, which is an inalienable feature of the attitude of science.[1]

The persisting search that is a consequence of the scientific attitude transposes all existing forms of power into subjects of inquiry. And in consequence, the establishment is uncomfortable with the university man, but so is the crusader and the revolutionary, for they, like the establishment, are hosts to fixed conclusions for which they seek endorsement.

They are an unseated establishment seeking a new status quo of their own liking. Like our colonial forefathers, they do not seek free religion or free politics, but to be under a government and to put us under a government which is to be themselves.

Like the establishment, they too are a form of authority, however unripened, and since they have a dogma they are subject to question by the university, whose function is eternal doubting toward more nearly perfect truth. The university's role is revisionism, and that includes revision even of the most recent revisions.

---

[1] Alexandr D. Alexandrov, "Promoting Mutual Understanding," in *Higher Education in Tomorrow's World*, pp. 145-46.

PART NINE

ASSESSING COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES: THE ALTERNATIVES

ASSESSING COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES: THE ALTERNATIVES

Carl T. Rowan

It is more than just a routine challenge to be asked to assess colleges and universities in this particular juncture in American history, with world affairs being what they are. I would have to call this an era of grim contradictions. It is an era in which men yearn for peace as perhaps they yearn for nothing else, while still they fight with a savagery unexceeded in human history. It is an era when black men die in disproportionate numbers in the jungles and paddies of Vietnam or Cambodia, and when they also can die in an early morning shoot-out in Los Angeles or in a street in Orangeburg, South Carolina, where trouble erupts because one man wants to keep his bowling alley lily white.

I stand before you at a time when we can put men on the moon and have them send back magnificent television photos–a marvel of communications! But it is an era also in which mothers cannot communicate with their daughters, or fathers with sons, or black Americans with white.

It is a time when we in this society enjoy an abundance never known to any other society. At the same time we are told the dollar is sick, the treasury is bare, and that while we can afford a variety of foreign follies we can't meet the deepest human needs of Americans who go without adequate education, or 25 million Americans who know poverty, or 10 to 14 million who know hunger and malnutrition.

I want to impress upon you that this is the atmosphere in which you asked me to assess our colleges and universities. Our colleges and universities today

are caught in a panoply of conflicts and pressures that threaten to tear this society apart. Indeed, I say without melodrama, that we in this society stand on the brink of perhaps the greatest wave of repression in our lifetimes.

One of the more frightening things is that there are advisers in the White House who have said to the President in writing that on your campuses there are large numbers of people who cannot be changed by any kinds of reforms; they say that if you achieve racial justice tomorrow or end the war in Indochina day after tomorrow it wouldn't make any difference to these wild revolutionaries because they're out to tear up your universities and they're out to tear up the country; and that the only way to deal with them is to have more bugging, more wiretapping, more informers, and more surveillance of just about any kind that anyone can produce.

Now, what does it mean in terms of what some people ought to be saying on your campuses? In the speeches I've given lately, I've done my darndest to say to those youngsters who will listen to me—and there are some who won't, I guarantee you—the time has come to mix a little brainpower with some of this anger and hostility that you've been manifesting. Do not go out and throw a brick at a window just to prove that you can do it or to try to prove to this other student that you're a bigger, tougher guy than he is, because you're playing into the hands of those who want greater repression in this society.

I gather from the fragments of news that I pick up that out at Kent State they have had a terrible situation today where four people have been killed. And that is not the end of this, I fear.

Now, this situation today—and the one tomorrow—is a direct result of what's taking place in Southeast Asia. I don't know any way to shut it off. All I know is that the colleges are caught in the middle and one of the problems is that our youngsters are faced with a profound crisis of belief. And I can understand why. I make it my business to stay as close to presidential utterances and shifts in policy in Southeast Asia and other parts of the world as I know how. And even I confess to a crisis of belief almost every day.

The violent exercise of bluff and bluster in Cambodia is much more than a question of whether President Nixon is courageous enough to risk being a one-term president. There is a grim risk of World War III in this action if you look down the road.

So this situation has helped poison the mainstream of American life. I don't doubt for a moment that millions of Americans were offended, troubled, frightened to hear President Nixon's ad lib comments when he talked about

campus bums. We all know that some of the protesters are uncouth, dirty, arrogant, ill-intentioned. We also know that a lot of them are fine American young men and women who are deeply disturbed by their government and who believe that we're wrong in Cambodia just as devoutly as President Nixon believes he's right.

I do think that if we are to get out of this miasma of fear; if in our confusion and in our strife this is not to become a society where we devour each other, the American college and university is going to have to lead the way. And I thought that I might talk a little bit about what I think by throwing out to you several questions that I've been asked most often the last 18 months on about 40 American campuses.

I don't think I visit a campus that someone doesn't say to me, "Mr. Rowan, is racial strife spreading in this country? Are we going backward? Is there no possibility that we can have any kind of harmony as between our black and our white students here and blacks and whites out in the community as a whole?"

And I have to answer them honestly and say, "Yes, racial strife is spreading." In this country we run the grim risk of an ugly confrontation that would be a tragedy because nobody could win it, a confrontation that I might best describe as black guerrilla warfare against white vigilantism.

Now, we run this kind of risk because there is too much emotion and not enough of the kind of knowledge that your institutions ought to be dispensing. We have on the one hand an alienated band of blacks who believe that by getting themselves a few bags of sand and a couple of rusty submachine guns and barricading themselves in an apartment they can take first-class citizenship. That seems to me to be an obvious exercise in self-destruction.

On the other hand, we have whites who believe that they can silence the legitimate part of the black revolution if they simply beef up the National Guard or give the cops enough rifles or put G. Harrold Carswell on the Supreme Court. We have to see if we can't put a little more logic into this question of who's going where in this society.

But I want to jump to the second question. I must have been asked at least a thousand times in the last 18 months, "Should we have a Black Studies program and who needs Black Studies? Wouldn't it be better if we tried to explain the black man's contribution to the building of this society in our regular history courses and our regular other courses?"

My answer is, "Yes, you do need a Black Studies program on your campus. But who needs it?" I think the white students need it much more than any black students you've got on your campus.

Most of the kids on our campuses are the products of a society where even today the two best-known Africans are Tarzan and Jane—and even they are of the lily-white variety. What we need to do is set up these studies—but with the expectation that everyone is going to work to keep black students from suckering themselves into making Black Studies a crutch. The black kid who walks on your campus and says, "I am going to major in Black Studies," ought to be run off the campus. I feel sorry for that kid because this is a youngster who had better get some English, some mathematics, and learn how to run a computer, and so forth.

But I know what the temptation is. When I was a graduate student in journalism the easiest thing in the world was to say, "I'm going to do my thesis on the Negro press." I knew, first of all, that my professor didn't know a darn thing about the Negro press and I could buffalo almost anything by him. But this is not scholarship.

Despite all the conflicts and confusions of today, that black student is going to have to go out there and compete with some white youngsters. I pray to God that he doesn't let Black Studies become an easy way of avoiding the hard work of getting the intellectual equipment, the trained intelligence that is required for survival in this kind of society.

Now, about this business of getting students. Universities must conclude that it is not in the interest of that university, it is not in the interest of the students, and it is not in the interest of this country, to have youngsters flunk out who, if they get through college, might become contributing citizens of this society. Some colleges saw this quickly, so they acceded to the black students' demand that the university set up special tutorial sessions in the summer.

"After all," these black kids said correctly, "you get a halfback in who can run the hundred in nine-four and has greased hips and you'll hire tutors from now till doomsday to keep that guy eligible." But, you don't want to hire any tutor to keep in school this poor kid who's handicapped by the fact that he went to the kind of high school I went to. For example, we had a library, so help me God, that you could get a maximum of two people in. One of them had to go out if you wanted to turn a page.

I got away! I had been in college as a math major for one year when I went down to Washburn University as a V-12 student. I found myself competing

with kids out of Wichita who had had analytical geometry in high school and I still hadn't heard of it.

What colleges have to do is *not* turn to a "natural aristocracy." We cannot go back to a system where kids are kept out of colleges and universities because their fathers were kept out and because they were cheated in kindergarten (if they had one), grade school, and high school. One of the things we can say about colleges and universities today is that they have wised up. They know, for example, that many of you just didn't know how to look at one of these black kids in the ghetto and determine whether or not he had potential. They admitted this at Dartmouth. They admitted they didn't even know how to recruit them. So this little handful of black students they had at Dartmouth said, "Well, all right, we will make you a deal. You give us some money to travel and to buy a meal or two, and put us out in the countryside. We'll find you some very sharp black kids with some tremendous potential." And they found them and Dartmouth's enrollment of black kids is today infinitely greater than it was. On the whole I think they will say that these youngsters have enriched the total of campus life despite whatever problems they brought with them.

One of the problems is inherent in another question I'm always asked. They say, "Mr. Rowan, now on my campus our kids are demanding separate black dormitories and they want this all-black unit recognized by the college. Should we give in to separatism and grant these all-black dorms?" Well, my answer is, "No, that's where I draw the line."

I confess that there are some biases of personal history involved here. I got out to Washburn and to my amazement found myself the only black in a unit of 337 sailors. Here I was, a green kid from totally segregated Tennessee, but I kept my head above water through that first semester and then, from Washington, came orders from the Navy Department transferring me to Northwestern.

A few days later a telegram came from Washington canceling the transfer to Northwestern because they wouldn't let me stay in the dormitory with the white sailors. Imagine my chagrin a quarter of a century later to pick up the newspaper and read that black students were rampaging on the Northwestern campus demanding a separate dormitory!

In my view if we are to have any chance of achieving a multiracial society; if we are to have any chance of turning this society into one in which the cancer of racism is reasonably cured, the colleges are going to have to take a position of leadership. This doesn't mean that anybody is asking a college adminis-

trator to force commingling. But we cannot, either out of expediency or stupidity, give sanction to racism and the separatism that breeds racism. Oh, I understand why some of these black kids go on this separatist kick. But the reality is that the black man in this country can't afford much in the way of vengeance. He doesn't have time for that sort of nonsense.

Then that next question. This one I always get from black students on campus. And I tell you this so that you can understand some of the confusion and some of the frustration with which you have to deal, and some of the kinds of personnel you had better get on your staffs if you want these youngsters properly counseled. They say, "But, Mr. Rowan, don't you feel that black solidarity is important these days. If black students come up with a proposal for black action am I not bound to go along to prove that I am a black man?"

I say, "When you talk to me about automatically going along with somebody's proposal, you don't sound as though you are talking about men; you sound as though you're talking about sheep. What is the measure of manhood? Is it to get out on the street and prove that you can curse Whitey louder than the next guy? Sometimes it's the bigger mark of a man to be able to say: 'what you propose is stupidity and I buy no part of it.' "

The problem as I see it today is to separate these youngsters who are full of honest idealism or confusion or despair, who are groping and demanding reasonably legitimate reforms, from that tiny band of self-styled revolutionaries who, I admit, don't want any reforms.

As long as we play the game where this tiny band of would-be terrorists and destroyers can carry the great mass of students along with them, we're in for trouble. And, of course, one of the ways to polarize the situation, so you can't separate the decent kids, is to utter words like campus bums (because that infuriates all of them) or go around talking about "a natural aristocracy" that ought to populate American campuses.

I want to get some kind of dialogue going on our campuses about a force that's at work in this country that's almost as pernicious as the ultra-right wing tendency toward fascism or racism. I refer to what I call the Horatio Alger syndrome. I could solve the poverty problem personally if I had a million dollars for every fat cat who strode up to me and said, "Oh, Mr. Rowan, I sure admire the things you've accomplished since you were bogged down in poverty down in McMinnville, Tennessee. Now, if you can do it without a bunch of government handouts, I don't see why these other bums can't do it." And this is an invitation to me to stick my fingers in my lapel and say, "Yeah, I'm a self-made man. Lifted myself by my bootstraps."

Well, no matter how many sweet introductions I listen to, I'll never forget what it means to live in abject poverty. It wipes out hope, destroys initiative, forecloses horizons, with the result that it is only the extremely able or the extremely lucky who leap all the hurdles, jump all the barriers, and get to the point where they even have a chance in that race we call the pursuit of happiness.

And if somebody tells you, "Well, Rowan was extremely able," I'll never deny it. But I sure know how lucky I've been. Would you believe that in 1943, almost this month, I was standing on the steps of Tennessee State College in Nashville saying goodbye to my good buddy, Joe Bates, because I didn't have the $20 for the next quarter's tuition?

"I sure hate to see you go, Buddy," Joe said, "but before you leave how about walking with me to The Greasy Spoon. I got to have a pack of cigarettes."

I said, "Joe, The Greasy Spoon doesn't open till 11:00."

He said, "I've got to check; I'm dying for a smoke."

So I walked down with him, and sure enough, The Greasy Spoon was padlocked. We turned to walk away, crossed this little dirt circle where the dinky bus made its U-turn and the students got out and threw their green bus transfers away. There were always fourteen zillion transfers on the ground and in the weeds. I took about four steps up the walk and something said to me, "Carl Rowan, one of those green wads you saw in the weeds was not a bus transfer."

I walked back, picked it up, rammed it in my pocket, and I said, "Joe, I found some money and it didn't look like a one." And when I got behind the hedges I opened it. It was a $20 bill. Well, I surmised what had happened. A student on his or her way to pay tuition had lost it. I turned to Joe and said, "Buddy, I just hope to God whoever lost it doesn't need it as badly as I do." And I walked up and paid my tuition for the next quarter.

Three days later I was sitting in Professor Merle Epps' history class, noting that he was unexplainably late. I was doing my best, frankly, to take advantage of it. I was trying to talk a cute little girl into cutting class and going for a stroll in Centennial Park, when in walked Professor Epps.

Without saying anything to the class he said, "Carl Rowan, come with me to the dean's office." My heart jumped to my throat. Those were the days when,

if a student went to the dean's office the student wondered what *he'd* done wrong. Professor Epps said nary a word and my heart pounded all the harder as we walked into the dean's office. His opening words were, "Dean Gore, this is the young man who's volunteering to join the Navy."

"What? I'm not volunteering to join any Navy," I said.

He said, "Shut up, boy, you're going to join the Navy."

Dean Gore said, "Just a minute, Professor Epps."

He said, "Young man, I think you know that in the whole history of this country there has never been a Negro naval officer."

I said, "Yes, sir, I know."

He said, "All I want you to do is read a little series of telegrams between me and the Secretary of the Navy."

He handed me the first one. It said, "Nationally competitive examinations, Navy V-12 Officer Training School, May so-and-so. Hope some of your students will take exam."

He said, "Now, you know we get a lot of telegrams here at all-Negro Tennessee State that they really meant for all-white University of Tennessee over in Knoxville, so I sent the Secretary of the Navy this telegram."

It said, "Do you really mean us?"

"I got this one back," Dean Gore said.

It read: "Yes, we mean you."

Dean Gore continued: "Now, I asked Professor Epps and a couple of other professors to look around campus and pick out some young men to take the exam. You know, we don't want to look too bad on this test. Now, I know that out of loyalty to your school and loyalty to your race and loyalty to your country—"

I said, "Yes, sir, I get the point. I volunteer to join the Navy."

Well, I took the exam. Fortunately I passed. I got to Midshipman's School, got my commission and that was the great turning point in the life of a green,

country kid from a little red clay county in Tennessee. A kid who, I am afraid by Mr. Agnew's standards, never would have set foot on the campus of Oberlin College or any of the institutions you represent. But that was the great turning point.

Oh, I know. The Horatio Algers say, "But you had to pass that exam."

I reply: "Of course! You've never heard me utter a word against industriousness or hard work or study. I believe in it. But let me tell you this: If I hadn't found the $20 bill I wouldn't have known the examinations were taking place and I might today still be toting bags at Brown's Hotel in McMinnville, Tennessee."

So you're going to hear me scream when a President says an education bill is inflationary and I look around at a handful of weapon systems and see that the cost of one is more than the total amount asked for in that education bill. You're going to hear me screaming when anybody wants to cut an appropriation for an elementary and secondary education act that's put more than a million kids in college who wouldn't be there. If we don't get these kids in college, there isn't going to be any peace and tranquility on your campuses. There isn't going to be any peace and tranquility in this country, even, if they produce repression to the point where we can hardly breathe because it's stifling us to death.

The American college, the American university has to speak up with guts and courage and ward off an era of repression. It is on your campuses that we presume that we find the kind of enlightenment expressed in these words once spoken by Justice David Josiah Brewer. He said, "It is written by the finger of the Almighty on the everlasting tablets of the universe that no nation can prosper and endure through whose life does not run the golden thread of exact and universal justice."

If we try to retrench in education, to make it available to fewer Americans rather than more Americans, whatever the problems they may bring, we weave not that golden thread of justice but a rope of sand that will turn out to be quicksand.

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE TESTING PROGRAM

The American College Testing Program conducts its nationwide and international educational service activities from a headquarters complex, six regional offices, four subregional branches, and a Washington, D.C., office. The national headquarters building is located in suburban Iowa City, Iowa, at 2201 North Dodge Street. General mailing address is P.O. Box 168, Iowa City, Iowa 52240.

National Officers

Fred F. Harcleroad, *President*
Oluf M. Davidsen, *Vice President-Program Operations*
Marvin F. Brecht, *Vice President-Business and Finance and Treasurer*
Kenneth E. Young, *Vice President-Washington, D.C. Office*
Arthur E. Smith, *Vice President-Educational Services*
Leo A. Munday, *Vice President-Research and Development*

For Consultation Assistance

Western Regional Office
Downtown Plaza Towers, Suite 515
555 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California 95814

Mountain-Plains Regional Office
Executive Office Building
720 Pearl Street
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Kansas-Nebraska Office
P.O. Box 1104
Manhattan, Kansas 66502

Southwestern Regional Office
Coronado Building
1626 50th Street
Lubbock, Texas 79412

Texas Office
909 Dalworth, Suite 201A
Grand Prairie, Texas 75050

Oklahoma-Arkansas Office
Nichols Hills Exec. Bldg., Suite 105
6403 N.W. Grand Boulevard
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73116

Midwestern Regional Office
899 Skokie Boulevard
Northbrook, Illinois 60062

Ohio-Indiana Office
133 North Prospect Street
Bowling Green, Ohio 43402

Southeastern Regional Office
20 Perimeter Park, Suite 101
Atlanta, Georgia 30341

Eastern Regional Office
General Washington Building
216 Goddard Boulevard
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

ACT PUBLICATIONS

The ACT publications listed here may be obtained, if copies are available, by writing to: ACT Publications, P.O. Box 168, Iowa City, Iowa 52240.

ACT and the Two-Year College: A Guide for Using ACT Services in Two-Year Institutions. Describes ACT services and programs designed specifically for junior and community colleges and vocational-technical institutions. Free.

ACT Financial Aid Services. Describes ACT's three major financial aid services available for use by students and institutions of higher education. Explains operation of systems used in ACT Student Need Analysis Service. Free.

Announcement of the ACT Research Services. Describes ACT's descriptive and predictive research services, which are designed to help colleges understand themselves and their students. Free.

Announcing the Career Planning Program. (Brochure) A description of the instruments, information services, and procedures for participating in this new ACT guidance-oriented program. Free.

College Student Profiles: Norms for the ACT Assessment. Describes students, by geographic region and institutional level, enrolled in ACT colleges and universities. $3.50, or $3.00 if check accompanies order.

Counselor's Handbook: A Guide for Using ACT Services in Pre-College Guidance. Provides secondary school counselors with pertinent and accessible information for use in advising college-bound students and their parents. Free.

The Developing State Colleges and Universities: Historical Background, Current Status, and Future Plans, by Fred F. Harcleroad, H. Bradley Sagen, & C. Theodore Molen, Jr. Describes a project undertaken to determine the extent and kind of change that has taken place in the developing state colleges and universities in the past and is projected for the near future. $3.00.

Educational Opportunity Service Announcement. (Brochure) Summarizes a new institutional service designed to inform prospective students of special or unusual educational or scholarship programs available at the institution, and outlines procedures necessary for participation. Free.

Institutional Self-Study Service. (Brochure) Describes the purpose, design, and features of the service for assessing the quality of education provided at specific institutions. Free.

Quiz for College Presidents and All Others Who Care about Students. Features a quiz (with answers) on college students, plus a description of the

mechanics and philosophy of the overall ACT Program. The seven-part quiz gives an insight into the thinking of today's college students. Free.

Using ACT on the Campus. A guide for the use of ACT services at institutions of higher education. Provides assistance in understanding and using ACT data in colleges for admissions, scholarship selection, course sectioning, and personnel services. Free.

When You Listen, This Is What You Can Hear, by Gordon A. Sabine. The results of YOUTHPOLL, a mail questionnaire survey conducted in the fall of 1970, among a sample of college freshmen and high school seniors who had taken the ACT Battery the preceding year. The poll gave the students the opportunity to comment candidly about their parents, their schools and teachers, and student protest. $3.00.

Monographs

ACT Monographs on selected topics in educational research are published periodically as a public service. Copies may be obtained for $3.00 each, if available, by writing to: ACT Publications, P. O. Box 168, Iowa City, Iowa 52240.

No. 1 *Computer Applications to Financial Aid Processing,* by R. M. Brown, S. S. Janes, & I. O. Overman (Out of print)

No. 2 *The Two-Year College and Its Students: An Empirical Report,* by the staff of the Research and Development Division

A collection of several special reports concerning two-year colleges and their students. The focus is on institutional characteristics, student characteristics, and predictions.

No. 3 *The Ghetto College Student: A Descriptive Essay on College Youth from the Inner City,* by G. D. Morgan

Provides an enlightened picture of young people from the ghettos. It is based on a series of interviews of teachers as well as students.

No. 4 *Open Admissions and Equal Access,* by P. R. Rever, Ed.

Based on selected papers read at the 1970 annual meeting of the American Association for Higher Education.

No. 5 *Financing Higher Education: Alternatives for the Federal Government,* by M. D. Orwig, Ed.

A collection of special papers, divided into four basic parts: (1) The Economic and Social Background; (2) Who Should Pay: Alternative Strategies for Financing; (3) Alternatives for the Federal Government; (4) The Road Ahead.

Research Reports

The ACT Research Reports are published periodically by the Research and Development Division of The American College Testing Program. Copies of the reports may be obtained, if available, by writing to the Research and Development Division, The American College Testing Program, P.O. Box 168, Iowa City, Iowa 52240.

No. 1 *A Description of American College Freshmen,* by C. Abe, J. L. Holland, S. W. Lutz, & J. M. Richards, Jr.

No. 2 *Academic and Nonacademic Accomplishment: Correlated or Uncorrelated?* by J. L. Holland, & J. M. Richards, Jr.

No. 3 *A Description of College Freshmen: I. Students with Different Choices of Major Field,* by C. Abe, & J. L. Holland

No. 4 *A Description of College Freshmen: II. Students with Different Vocational Choices,* by C. Abe, & J. L. Holland

No. 5 *A Description of Junior Colleges,* by J. M. Richards, Jr., L. M. Rand, & L. P. Rand

No. 6 *Comparative Predictive Validities of the American College Tests and Two Other Scholastic Aptitude Tests,* by L. A. Munday

No. 7 *The Relationship between College Grades and Adult Achievement: A Review of the Literature,* by D. P. Hoyt

No. 8 *A Factor Analysis of Student "Explanations" of Their Choice of a College,* by J. M. Richards, Jr., & J. L. Holland

No. 9 *Regional Differences in Junior Colleges,* by J. M. Richards, Jr., L. P. Rand, & L. M. Rand

No. 10 *Academic Description and Prediction in Junior Colleges,* by D. P. Hoyt, & L. A. Munday

No. 11 *The Assessment of Student Accomplishment in College,* by J. M. Richards, Jr., J. L. Holland, & S. W. Lutz

No. 12 *Academic and Nonacademic Accomplishment in a Representative Sample Taken from a Population of 612,000,* by J. L. Holland, & J. M. Richards, Jr.

No. 13 *The Prediction of Student Accomplishment in College,* by J. M. Richards, Jr., J. L. Holland, & S. W. Lutz

No. 14 *Changes in Self-Ratings and Life Goals among Students at Colleges with Different Characteristics,* by R. W. Skager, J. L. Holland, & L. A. Braskamp

No. 15 *Can Computers Write College Admissions Tests?* by J. M. Richards, Jr.

No. 16 *Changes in Self-Ratings and Life Goals as Related to Student Accomplishment in College,* by R. W. Skager, & L. A. Braskamp

No. 17 *Family Income and the Characteristics of College-Bound Students,* by L. L. Baird

No. 18 *Predicting a Student's Vocational Choice,* by J. L. Holland, & S. W. Lutz

No. 19 *The Educational Goals of College-Bound Youth,* by L. L. Baird

No. 20 *Who Goes Where to Junior College?* by J. M. Richards, Jr., & L. A. Braskamp

No. 21 *Predicting Student Accomplishment in College from the ACT Assessment,* by J. M. Richards, Jr., & S. W. Lutz

No. 22 *The Undecided Student: How Different Is He?* by L. L. Baird

No. 23 *The Effects of Selecting College Students by Various Kinds of High School Achievement,* by L. L. Baird, & J. M. Richards, Jr.

No. 24 *Do They Do What They Say They Will Do?* by S. W. Lutz

No. 25 *Changes in the Vocational Plans of College Students: Orderly or Random?* by J. L. Holland, & D. R. Whitney

No. 26 *The Flow of High School Students to Schools, Colleges, and Jobs,* by L. L. Baird, & J. L. Holland

No. 27 *Forecasting Academic Success in Specific Colleges,* by D. P. Hoyt

No. 28 *A Description of Graduates of Two-Year Colleges,* by L. L. Baird, J. M. Richards, Jr., & L. R. Shevel

No. 29 *An Empirical Occupational Classification Derived from a Theory of Personality and Intended for Practice and Research,* by J. L. Holland, D. R. Whitney, N. S. Cole, & J. M. Richards, Jr.

No. 30 *Differential Validity in the ACT Tests,* by N. S. Cole

No. 31 *Who Is Talented? An Analysis of Achievement,* by C. F. Elton, & L. R. Shevel

No. 32 *Patterns of Educational Aspiration,* by L. L. Baird

No. 33 *Can Financial Need Analysis Be Simplified?* by M. D. Orwig, & P. K. Jones

No. 34 *Research Strategies in Studying College Impact,* by K. A. Feldman

No. 35 *An Analysis of Spatial Configuration and Its Application to Research in Higher Education,* by N. S. Cole, & J. W. L. Cole

No. 36 *Influence of Financial Need on the Vocational Development of College Students,* by A. R. Vander Well

No. 37 *Practices and Outcomes of Vocational-Technical Education in Technical and Community Colleges,* by T. G. Gartland, & J. F. Carmody

No. 38 *Bayesian Considerations in Educational Information Systems,* by M. R. Novick

No. 39 *Interactive Effects of Achievement Orientation and Teaching Style on Academic Achievement,* by G. Domino

No. 40 *An Analysis of the Structure of Vocational Interests,* by N. S. Cole, & G. R. Hanson

No. 41 *How Do Community College Transfer and Occupational Students Differ?* by E. J. Brue, H. B. Engen, & E. J. Maxey

No. 42 *Applications of Bayesian Methods to the Prediction of Educational Performance,* by M. R. Novick, P. H. Jackson, D. T. Thayer, & N. S. Cole

No. 43 *Toward More Equitable Distribution of College Student Aid Funds: Problems in Assessing Student Financial Need,* by M. D. Orwig

No. 44 *Converting Test Data to Counseling Information,* by D. J. Prediger